



## THE POLITICAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND

*Seventy-five years have passed since Lingard completed his HISTORY OF ENGLAND, which ends with the Revolution of 1688. During that period historical study has made a great advance. Year after year the mass of materials for a new History of England has increased; new lights have been thrown on events and characters, and old errors have been corrected. Many notable works have been written on various periods of our history; some of them at such length as to appeal almost exclusively to professed historical students. It is believed that the time has come when the advance which has been made in the knowledge of English history as a whole should be laid before the public in a single work of fairly adequate size. Such a book should be founded on independent thought and research, but should at the same time be written with a full knowledge of the works of the best modern historians and with a desire to take advantage of their teaching wherever it appears sound.*

*The vast number of authorities, printed and in manuscript, on which a History of England should be based, if it is to represent the existing state of knowledge, renders co-operation almost necessary and certainly advisable. The History, of which this volume is an instalment, is an attempt to set forth in a readable form the results at present attained by research. It will consist of twelve volumes by twelve different writers, each*

*of them chosen as being specially capable of dealing with the period which he undertakes, and the editors, while leaving to each author as free a hand as possible, hope to insure a general similarity in method of treatment, so that the twelve volumes may in their contents, as well as in their outward appearance, form one History.*

*As its title imports, this History will primarily deal with politics, with the History of England and, after the date of the union with Scotland, Great Britain, as a state or body politic; but as the life of a nation is complex, and its condition at any given time cannot be understood without taking into account the various forces acting upon it, notices of religious matters and of intellectual, social, and economic progress will also find place in these volumes. The footnotes will, so far as is possible, be confined to references to authorities, and references will not be appended to statements which appear to be matters of common knowledge and do not call for support. Each volume will have an Appendix giving some account of the chief authorities, original and secondary, which the author has used. This account will be compiled with a view of helping students rather than of making long lists of books without any notes as to their contents or value. That the History will have faults both of its own and such as will always in some measure attend co-operative work, must be expected, but no pains have been spared to make it, so far as may be, not wholly unworthy of the greatness of its subject.*

*Each volume, while forming part of a complete History, will also in itself be a separate and complete book, will be sold separately, and will have its own index, and two or more maps.*

**The History is divided as follows :—**

- Vol. I. FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE NORMAN CONQUEST (to 1066).** By **Thomas Hodgkin, D.C.L., Litt.D.,** Fellow of University College, London; Fellow of the British Academy. With 2 Maps
- Vol. II. FROM THE NORMAN CONQUEST TO THE DEATH OF JOHN (1066-1216).** By **George Burton Adams,** Professor of History in Yale University. With 2 Maps.
- Vol. III. FROM THE ACCESSION OF HENRY III. TO THE DEATH OF EDWARD III. (1216-1377).** By **T. F. Tout, M.A.,** Professor of Mediaeval and Modern History in the University of Manchester; Fellow of the British Academy; formerly Fellow of Pembroke College, Oxford. With 3 Maps.
- Vol. IV. FROM THE ACCESSION OF RICHARD II. TO THE DEATH OF RICHARD III. (1377-1485).** By **C. Oman, M.A., LL.D.,** Chichele Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford; Fellow of the British Academy. With 3 Maps.
- Vol. V. FROM THE ACCESSION OF HENRY VII. TO THE DEATH OF HENRY VIII. (1485-1547).** By **H. A. L. Fisher, M.A.,** Fellow and Tutor of New College, Oxford; Fellow of the British Academy. With 2 Maps.
- Vol. VI. FROM THE ACCESSION OF EDWARD VI. TO THE DEATH OF ELIZABETH (1547-1603).** By **A. F. Pollard M.A., Litt.D.,** Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford, and Professor of English History in the University of London. With 2 Maps.
- Vol. VII. FROM THE ACCESSION OF JAMES I. TO THE RESTORATION (1603-1660).** By **F. C. Montague, M.A.,** Astor Professor of History in University College, London; formerly Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. With 3 Maps.

*[Continued on next page.]*

**Vol. VIII. FROM THE RESTORATION TO THE DEATH OF WILLIAM III. (1660-1702).** By Richard Lodge, M.A., LL.D., Professor of History in the University of Edinburgh; formerly Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford. With 2 Maps.

**Vol. IX. FROM THE ACCESSION OF ANNE TO THE DEATH OF GEORGE II. (1702-1760).** By I. S. Leadam, M.A., formerly Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford. With 8 Maps.

**Vol. X. FROM THE ACCESSION OF GEORGE III. TO THE CLOSE OF PITT'S FIRST ADMINISTRATION (1760-1801).** By the Rev. William Hunt, M.A., D.Litt., Trinity College, Oxford. With 3 Maps.

**Vol. XI. FROM ADDINGTON'S ADMINISTRATION TO THE CLOSE OF WILLIAM IV.'S REIGN (1801-1837).** By the Hon. George C. Brodrick, D.C.L., late Warden of Merton College, Oxford, and J. K. Fotheringham, M.A., D.Litt., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford; Lecturer in Ancient History at King's College, London. With 3 Maps.

**Vol. XII. THE REIGN OF QUEEN VICTORIA (1837-1901).** By Sidney Low, M.A., Fellow of King's College, London, formerly Scholar of Balliol College, Oxford, and Lloyd C. Sanders, B.A. With 3 Maps.



# The Political History of England

IN TWELVE VOLUMES

EDITED BY WILLIAM HUNT, D.LITT., AND  
RICHARD L. POOLE, M.A., LL.D.

090

IX.

THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND  
FROM THE ACCESSION OF ANNE TO THE  
DEATH OF GEORGE II.

(1702-1760)

2811 RR2/E F



# THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND

FROM THE ACCESSION OF ANNE TO THE  
DEATH OF GEORGE II

(1702-1760)

143

I S LEADAM, M.A

FORMERLY FELLOW OF REASE AT COLLEGE OXFORD

NEW IMPRESSION

11.4.4

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

**NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA**

1912



# CONTENTS.

## CHAPTER I.

### THE GRAND ALLIANCE.

	PAGE
8 March, 1702	Accession of Anne . . . . . 1
	The queen's appearance and character . . . . . 2
April.	Influence of the Earl of Rochester . . . . . 3
May.	Commercial interests and the war . . . . . 5
June.	The constituents of the grand alliance . . . . . 7
July-Nov.	Marlborough's campaign in the Netherlands . . . . . 9
July-Sept.	Rooke's expedition against Cadiz . . . . . 12
Oct.	Rooke captures the Spanish treasure fleet . . . . . 14
July-Nov.	Benbow's action, and death . . . . . 14
March-Sept., 1703.	Marlborough's campaign in the Netherlands . . . . . 15
Feb.-Oct.	Operations of the French and Bavarians . . . . . 16
Nov. 8.	Savoy joins the grand alliance . . . . . 18
May-Nov.	Naval operations . . . . . 13-21
July-Oct.	Feeling in Spain . . . . . 21
May.	Portugal enters the grand alliance . . . . . 22
Dec.	The Methuen treaty . . . . . 23

## CHAPTER II.

### HOME POLITICS.

July, 1702.	Election of Anne's first parliament . . . . . 25
12 Nov.	Thanksgiving for victories of Marlborough, Ormonde, and Rooke . . . . . 26
Feb., 1703.	Inquiry into Rooke's conduct . . . . . 27
Dec., 1702.	Tory attack on alien peers . . . . . 29
	Bill against occasional conformity . . . . . 31
March, 1703.	Nottingham dismisses whig officials . . . . . 31
Nov.	Second occasional conformity bill; the tack . . . . . 37
Dec., 1703.	The Scottish plot . . . . . 38
March, 1704.	The house of lords and the Aylesbury election . . . . . 4
	Harley and St. John . . . . . 42

## CHAPTER III.

### THE WAR AND PARTIES.

1704.	The French plan of campaign . . . . . 41
	Marlborough's plan of campaign . . . . . 41

		PAGE
May	Marlborough's march to Blenheim . . . . .	50
2 July.	Marlborough storms the Schellenberg . . . . .	52
13 Aug.	The battle of Blenheim . . . . .	54
6 Aug.	Rooke captures Gibraltar . . . . .	60
24 Aug.	Rooke's action off Malaga . . . . .	61
May.	The British and Dutch in Portugal . . . . .	63
9 Nov.	Admiral Sir John Leake relieves Gibraltar . . . . .	64
Dec.	Parliament and the Aylesbury election . . . . .	67
5 April, 1705.	Dissolution of Anne's first parliament . . . . .	67
25 Oct.	Meeting of Anne's second parliament . . . . .	69
Nov.	Parliament and the Electress Sophia . . . . .	69
	Ireland . . . . .	71

# CHAPTER IV.

## THE NETHERLANDS AND THE PENINSULA.

17 July, 1705.	Marlborough forces the French lines . . . . .	76
Aug.	Marlborough's difficulties with the Dutch generals . . . . .	77
Nov.	Marlborough negotiates at Vienna . . . . .	79
May, 1706.	Marlborough's victory at Ramillies . . . . .	80
	The "Barrier" . . . . .	82
	Friction between England and the Dutch . . . . .	84
June, 1705.	The campaign of the British and Dutch in the Peninsula . . . . .	85
	The Earl of Peterborough . . . . .	86
	Peterborough captures Barcelona . . . . .	87
May, 1706.	Operations of Lord Galway in the west of Spain . . . . .	88
27 June.	Galway occupies Madrid . . . . .	89
4 Aug.	The allies evacuate Madrid . . . . .	91
	The Marquis de Guiscard . . . . .	91
	Rivalry of Rivers and Galway in Spain . . . . .	92

# CHAPTER V.

## THE UNION WITH SCOTLAND.

May, 1703.	The Scots parliament . . . . .	94
June.	The "Act of Security" and the "Act anent Peace and War" . . . . .	95
July, 1704.	The Scots parliament again passes the "Act of Security" . . . . .	96
Dec.	Retaliatory measures of the English parliament . . . . .	98
Oct., 1706.	Agitation in Scotland against union . . . . .	103
Jan., 1707.	The Act of Union passed by the Scots parliament . . . . .	106
6 March.	The English Act of Union receives the royal assent . . . . .	107
March-May.	Discontent in Scotland . . . . .	107

CHAPTER VI.

THE CAMPAIGNS OF 1707 AND 1708.

		PAGE
Feb., 1707.	The allies in the east of Spain . . . . .	109
25 April.	Berwick defeats Galway at Almanza . . . . .	110
July.	Prince Eugene and Admiral Shovell co-operate against Toulon . . . . .	111
April.	Marlborough's embassy to Charles XII. of Sweden . . . . .	113
May-Nov.	Marlborough in the Netherlands . . . . .	114
April, 1708.	Plan of campaign . . . . .	115
11 July.	Marlborough's victory at Oudenarde . . . . .	116
27 Sept.	Webb's victory at Wynendaele . . . . .	118
Nov.-Dec.	Marlborough's relief of Brussels and capture of Lille . . . . .	119
Sept.	Stanhope captures Port Mahon . . . . .	121

CHAPTER VII.

GODOLPHIN AND HARLEY.

Aug., 1706.	Friction between the queen and the Duchess of Marl- borough . . . . .	123
Dec.	Displacement of tories from office; Sunderland secre- tary of state . . . . .	124
	The queen appoints two tory bishops . . . . .	125
July, 1707.	Growing influence of Mrs. Masham . . . . .	126
23 Oct.	Meeting of the first parliament of Great Britain . . . . .	127
Dec.	The Earl of Peterborough and the peers . . . . .	129
Jan., 1708.	Debate in the commons on the war in Spain . . . . .	130
Nov., 1707.	The treason of William Greg . . . . .	131
10 Feb., 1708.	Resignation of Harley . . . . .	133
March.	Projected invasion of Scotland . . . . .	135
28 Oct.	Death of Prince George of Denmark; ascendancy of the whigs . . . . .	139
May-July, 1709.	Immigration of Protestant refugees . . . . .	141

CHAPTER VIII.

THE BARRIER TREATY.

March, 1709.	Negotiation of the barrier treaty . . . . .	146
28 May.	The allies' preliminaries of peace . . . . .	147
May.	Renewal of the war in the Netherlands . . . . .	151
11 Sept.	Marlborough's victory at Malplaquet . . . . .	153
May, 1708-May, 1709.	The campaigns in Spain . . . . .	156
April, 1710.	The campaigns in the Netherlands . . . . .	158
June.	Failure of the peace conferences at Gertruydenberg . . . . .	159

CHAPTER IX.

THE IMPEACHMENT OF SACHEVERELL.

1709.	Friction between Godolphin and the junta . . . . .	160
Jan., 1710.	Friction between Marlborough and the queen . . . . .	162

	PAGE
The cabinet and Mrs. Masham . . . . .	163
April. Final rupture between the queen and the Duchess of Marlborough . . . . .	163
5 Nov., 1709. Sacheverell's sermon at St. Paul's . . . . .	164
Dec. Impeachment of Sacheverell . . . . .	166
Feb., 1710. Trial of Sacheverell . . . . .	167
13 June. Dismissal of Sunderland . . . . .	171
7 Aug. Dismissal of Godolphin . . . . .	172
Sept. Harley forms a ministry . . . . .	173
Oct. Secret negotiations with France . . . . .	175
Harley and the press; Swift . . . . .	177

## CHAPTER X.

## HARLEY'S MINISTRY.

17 Jan., 1711. The Duchess of Marlborough dismissed from office . . . . .	179
4 Jan. Lords' inquiry into the Peninsular campaigns . . . . .	179
The October club and the ministry . . . . .	180
8 March. Harley stabbed by Guiscard . . . . .	182
26 April. Harley created Earl of Oxford and Mortimer . . . . .	183
May. Incorporation of the South Sea Company . . . . .	185
July. Matthew Prior negotiates peace at Paris . . . . .	185
27 Sept. Preliminaries of peace agreed upon . . . . .	187
5 Aug. Marlborough penetrates the French lines . . . . .	188
4 June. Departure of Sir Hovenden Walker's expedition against Quebec . . . . .	189
7 Dec. Defeat of the ministry in the lords . . . . .	191
17 Jan., 1712. Robert Walpole sent to the Tower . . . . .	192
31 Dec., 1711. Dismissal of Marlborough . . . . .	192
Dec., 1711-Jan., 1712. Twelve tory peers created . . . . .	193

## CHAPTER XI.

## THE PEACE OF UTRECHT.

29 Jan., 1712. Opening of the conferences for peace at Utrecht . . . . .	195
April. Ormonde captain-general in the Netherlands . . . . .	197
July. Ormonde proclaims an armistice with France . . . . .	199
The tory ministry and Scottish affairs . . . . .	201
6 June. Announcement of the preliminaries of peace . . . . .	202
7 July. St. John created Viscount Bolingbroke . . . . .	202
11 April, 1713. Treaty of peace signed at Utrecht . . . . .	205
18 June. Defeat of Bolingbroke's proposed commercial treaty with France . . . . .	208

## CHAPTER XII.

## THE SUCCESSION IN DANGER.

3 Aug., 1713. Dissolution of parliament . . . . .	210
Intrigues of Bolingbroke . . . . .	211



	PAGE
Bolingbroke's Irish policy . . . . .	213
April, 1714. Dismissal of Argyll . . . . .	215
28 May. Death of the Electress Sophia . . . . .	217
The queen and the pretender . . . . .	217
Bolingbroke's schism bill . . . . .	217
27 July. Dismissal of Oxford . . . . .	219
1 Aug. Death of the queen . . . . .	221

CHAPTER XIII.

THE ACCESSION OF GEORGE I.

1712. Marlborough in retirement abroad . . . . .	223
6 Aug., 1714. Marlborough nominated captain-general . . . . .	224
31 Aug. Dismissal of Bolingbroke . . . . .	225
The new king . . . . .	226
18 Sept. Arrival of George I. at Greenwich . . . . .	228
Lord Townshend forms a ministry . . . . .	229
General James Stanhope . . . . .	229
The Hanoverian junta . . . . .	230
17 March, 1715. Meeting of a new parliament . . . . .	233
28 March. Flight of Bolingbroke . . . . .	235
June. Impeachment of late ministers . . . . .	236

CHAPTER XIV.

THE REBELLION OF 1715.

1715. The pretender . . . . .	239
Sept., 1714-Jan., 1715. The question of Dunkirk . . . . .	240
Jan., 1715. Stair's embassy to France . . . . .	241
July. Bolingbroke takes service with the pretender . . . . .	242
Preparations against invasion . . . . .	243
20 July. Flight of O'moade . . . . .	244
Marlborough and the pretender . . . . .	245
6 Sept. The Earl of Mar proclaims the pretender in Scotland . . . . .	246
14 Sept. The rebels occupy Perth . . . . .	247
21 Sept. Arrest of tory members . . . . .	248
6 Oct. Rising of Forster in Northumberland . . . . .	250
1 Nov. A party of Scottish rebels enters England . . . . .	252
13 Nov. Surrender of English and Scottish rebels at Preston . . . . .	254
13 Nov. Drawn battle at Sheriff Muir . . . . .	256

CHAPTER XV.

THE PRETENDER IN SCOTLAND. THE SEPTENNIAL ACT.

22 Dec., 1715. The pretender lands at Peterhead . . . . .	259
29 Jan., 1716. He retreats from Perth . . . . .	260
4 Feb. He re-embarks for France . . . . .	261
13/24 Feb. He dismisses Bolingbroke . . . . .	263
Fate of the rebel prisoners . . . . .	265

	PAGE
24 Feb., 1716. Execution of two rebel lords . . . . .	267
28 Feb. Dismissal of Nottingham . . . . .	267
7 May. The septennial act . . . . .	267
7 July. George I. embarks for Hanover . . . . .	271

## CHAPTER XVI.

## THE QUADRUPLÉ ALLIANCE, SPAIN, AND SWEDEN.

6 Feb., 1716. Treaty of Westminster between Great Britain and the States-general . . . . .	272
Dec., 1715-May, 1716. Bubb negotiates a new commercial and new Asiento treaty with Spain . . . . .	273
May, 1715. Admiral Sir John Norris commissioned to the Baltic . . . . .	274
18 Jan., 1717. George I. returns to London . . . . .	275
29 Jan. Arrest of the Swedish ambassador, Count Gyllenborg . . . . .	275
2 April. Admiral Sir George Byng sails for the Baltic . . . . .	277
4 Jan., 1717. Triple alliance concluded between England, France, and Holland . . . . .	278
15 Dec., 1716. Dismissal of Townshend . . . . .	279
10 April, 1717. Resignation of Walpole . . . . .	279
22 July-2 Aug., 1718. Stanhope negotiates the quadruple alliance . . . . .	280
11 Aug. Sir George Byng destroys the Spanish fleet off Cape Passaro . . . . .	281
7 March, 1719. Ormonde sails from Cadiz for England . . . . .	283
13 April. A Spanish force lands in Scotland . . . . .	284
10 June. General Wightman captures the Spanish troops at Glen Shiel . . . . .	284
Feb., 1720. Spain accedes to the quadruple alliance . . . . .	285
14 Aug., 1719. Treaty between Great Britain, Prussia, and Hanover . . . . .	286
18 Aug. Treaty between Great Britain and Sweden . . . . .	286

## CHAPTER XVII.

## ADMINISTRATION OF STANHOPE AND SUNDERLAND.

1 July, 1717. Acquittal of Oxford . . . . .	289
Nov. Quarrels between the king and the Prince of Wales . . . . .	289
1718. The ministry and the dissenters . . . . .	291
Jan., 1719. Stanhope carries a dissenters' relief bill . . . . .	291
The peerage bill . . . . .	291
18 Dec. Defeat of the peerage bill in the commons . . . . .	293
1720. The South Sea bubble . . . . .	293
22 Jan., 1720. Aislabe introduces the South Sea bill . . . . .	293
7 April. South Sea act passed . . . . .	293
10 Jan., 1721. Bill to punish the South Sea directors . . . . .	299
Jan.-March. Parliamentary inquiries into the South Sea Company's affairs . . . . .	300
5 Feb. Death of Stanhope . . . . .	300
Feb.-April. Townshend and Walpole again take office . . . . .	304

CHAPTER XVIII.

ADMINISTRATION OF TOWNSHEND AND WALPOLE.

	PAGE
31 Dec., 1720. Birth of Charles Edward, the young pretender . . . . .	305
1721. Jacobite intrigues . . . . .	305
24 Aug., 1722. Arrest of Bishop Atterbury . . . . .	306
" Plans of insurrection . . . . .	307
19 Oct., 1721. Announcement of Walpole's new commercial policy . . . . .	308
May, 1723. Return of Bolingbroke to England . . . . .	309
Carteret . . . . .	309
13 June, 1721. Alliance between Great Britain, France, and Spain . . . . .	310
1723. Rivalry of Carteret and Townshend . . . . .	310
Oct., 1723. The treaty with Prussia for a double marriage . . . . .	311
1709-23. Affairs of Ireland . . . . .	312
1722-23. Wood's halfpence . . . . .	314
April, 1724. Swift's first "Drapier's Letter" . . . . .	317
1724. The Drapier's letters; agitation in Ireland . . . . .	317
Aug., 1725. The ministry yield . . . . .	319
1725. Discontents in Scotland . . . . .	319

CHAPTER XIX.

TREATIES OF VIENNA AND HANOVER.

1720-21. Elisabeth Farnese, Queen of Spain . . . . .	321
Dec., 1722. The Emperor Charles VI. incorporates the Ostend East India Company . . . . .	322
April-May, 1725. Treaty of Vienna between Spain and the emperor . . . . .	323
July, 1725. Spain demands the cession of Gibraltar . . . . .	323
3 Sept. Treaty of Hanover between Great Britain, France, and Prussia . . . . .	324
5 Nov. Second and secret treaty of Vienna . . . . .	325
Aug., 1726. Russia adheres to the treaty of Vienna . . . . .	326
26 March, 1727. Sweden adheres to the treaty of Hanover . . . . .	326
12 Oct., 1726. Defection of Prussia from the treaty of Hanover . . . . .	327
Jan., 1727. England prepares for war . . . . .	328
Feb. Spain besieges Gibraltar . . . . .	330
31 May. Preliminaries of peace signed at Paris . . . . .	330
12 June. Death of George I. . . . .	332

CHAPTER XX.

ENGLAND, SPAIN, AND FRANCE.

1727. Walpole retained in office . . . . .	334
The opposition . . . . .	335
6 March, N.S., 1728. The convention of the Pardo . . . . .	337
14 June. Congress of Soissons . . . . .	337
9 Nov., 1729. Treaty of Seville between Great Britain and Spain . . . . .	338
16 March, 1731. Second (public) treaty of Vienna between Great Britain, the emperor, and Holland . . . . .	338
1729-30. Growing friction between Great Britain and France . . . . .	339

## CHAPTER XXI.

## THE EXCISE BILL.

	PAGE
1725-29. Alienation between Walpole and Townshend . . .	340
15 May, 1730. Retirement of Townshend . . . . .	341
1728. Frederick, Prince of Wales, and the opposition . . .	342
1729-32. Walpole's domestic policy . . . . .	342
1733. Walpole's scheme of tariff reform . . . . .	344
11 April, 1733. The excise bill dropped . . . . .	345
Walpole's new maxims of government . . . . .	346
Dismissals of leaders of the opposition . . . . .	347

## CHAPTER XXII.

## THE FALL OF WALPOLE.

7 Nov., 1733. Signature of the family compact between France and Spain . . . . .	349
1729-43. Parliament and the liquor trade . . . . .	350
7 Sept., 1736. The Porteous riot at Edinburgh . . . . .	352
1736-37. Social reforms; smuggling and stage plays . . . .	353
1736-39. Walpole and the dissenters . . . . .	353
27 April, 1736. Marriage of Frederick, Prince of Wales . . . .	355
20 Nov., 1737. Death of Queen Caroline; her character . . . .	357
March, 1738. Inquiry into complaints against Spain; Jenkins's ear .	358
14 Jan., 1739, N.S. Convention of Madrid . . . . .	360
William Pitt . . . . .	360
9 March. Secession of the opposition from the house of commons . . . . .	361
June. Preparations for war with Spain . . . . .	362
23 Oct. Declaration of war with Spain . . . . .	363
21 Nov. Admiral Vernon takes Porto Bello . . . . .	363
5 Feb., 1740. Admiral Wager introduces bill for recruiting the navy	365
Oct. Fleet under Sir Chaloner Ogle sails to reinforce Vernon . . . . .	366
18 Sept. Commodore George Anson sails for the Pacific . . . .	366
20 Oct. Death of the emperor, Charles VI. . . . .	366
Feb., 1741. Walpole defeats the opposition . . . . .	367
1 Dec., 1741. Meeting of a new parliament . . . . .	368
11 Feb., 1742. Resignation of Walpole . . . . .	369
The new ministry . . . . .	369
1742. Inquiry into Walpole's conduct fruitless . . . . .	370

## CHAPTER XXIII.

## THE CARTERET ADMINISTRATION.

11 June, 1742. Restoration of peace between Prussia and Austria by the treaty of Breslau . . . . .	371
1 Feb., 1742. Charles Emanuel of Sardinia joins Austria against Spain . . . . .	372

9 Aug.	Commodore Martin's squadron threatens to bombard Naples . . . . .	372
March.	Lord Stair commander-in-chief of the British army in the Netherlands . . . . .	372
Aug.	The case of the Hanoverian troops . . . . .	373
18 Nov.	Treaty of Westminster with Prussia . . . . .	374
27 June, 1743.	Battle of Dettingen . . . . .	374
	Rivalry of Carteret and the Pelhams . . . . .	377
	Irritation of France against England . . . . .	378
22 Feb., 1744.	Action with French and Spanish fleets off Toulon . . . . .	379
	Prince Charles Edward, the young pretender . . . . .	380
	Failure of French attempt at invasion . . . . .	381
4/15 March.	France formally declares war . . . . .	381
June.	Return of Commodore Anson with the Spanish treasure . . . . .	382
24 Nov.	Resignation of Granville (Carteret) . . . . .	383
1745.	William, Duke of Cumberland, captain-general in the Netherlands . . . . .	385
11 May.	Battle of Fontenoy . . . . .	386
7 May.	Alliance of Genoa with France and Spain . . . . .	389
27 June.	Commodore Peter Warren captures Louisbourg . . . . .	390

# CHAPTER XXIV.

## THE REBELLION OF 1745.

19 Aug., 1745.	Prince Charles Edward, the young pretender, appears in arms . . . . .	391
17 Sept.	The Jacobite army occupies Edinburgh . . . . .	393
21 Sept.	Jacobite victory at Preston Pans . . . . .	394
	Feeling in London . . . . .	395
Nov.	The Jacobite army occupies Carlisle and Manchester . . . . .	396
4 Dec.	Advance of the rebels to Derby . . . . .	398
20 Dec.	Prince Charles recrosses the border . . . . .	401
17 Jan., 1746.	Defeat of General Hawley at Falkirk . . . . .	402
16 April.	Cumberland's victory at Culloden . . . . .	404
	Trials and executions of rebel leaders . . . . .	408

# CHAPTER XXV.

## THE PELHAM ADMINISTRATION.

Feb., 1746.	Attempted change of ministry; victory of the Pelhams . . . . .	411
Sept.	Peace conference at Breda . . . . .	413
2 July.	Battle of Laffeldt . . . . .	414
3 May, 1747.	Admiral Anson's victory off Cape Finisterre . . . . .	415
	The English and French in India . . . . .	415
30 April, 1748.	The peace of Aix-la-Chapelle . . . . .	416
1749.	The prince's party . . . . .	419
	Domestic policy of Pelham . . . . .	420

	PAGE
3 Oct., 1750. Treaty of Madrid . . . . .	421
1751. Parliament and the liquor trade . . . . .	422
Reform of the calendar . . . . .	423
20 March. Death of Frederick, Prince of Wales . . . . .	424
1749-54. Friction between England and Ireland . . . . .	425

## CHAPTER XXVI.

## PITT.

1752. Disputes between Great Britain and Prussia . . . . .	427
1753. Hardwicke's marriage act . . . . .	428
The naturalisation of the Jews . . . . .	428
Domestic reforms . . . . .	429
6 March, 1754. Death of Henry Pelham . . . . .	430
1751. The struggle with France in India . . . . .	431
1753-54. The struggle with France in North America . . . . .	432
9 July, 1755. Defeat of General Braddock . . . . .	433
Nov., 1754. Pitt attacks Newcastle . . . . .	435
7 June, 1755. Admiral Boscawen attacks a French fleet . . . . .	436
Pitt and Newcastle . . . . .	437
12 March, 1756. The militia bill . . . . .	438
16 Jan., 1756. Convention of Westminster between Great Britain and Prussia . . . . .	439
The state of the navy . . . . .	441
20 May. Admiral Byng engages the French fleet . . . . .	443
28 June. Surrender of Fort St. Philip, Port Mahon . . . . .	443
Nov. Pitt forms a ministry . . . . .	445
Pitt and the war . . . . .	447
27 Jan., 1757. Byng condemned to death . . . . .	449
14 March. Execution of Byng . . . . .	450
6 April. Dismissal of Pitt . . . . .	450

## CHAPTER XXVII.

## DEFEAT AND VICTORY.

20 June, 1756. The black hole of Calcutta . . . . .	452
8 Sept., 1757. Convention of Kloster-Zeven . . . . .	453
Retirement of Cumberland . . . . .	454
June, 1758. Expedition against Cherbourg . . . . .	455
Aug. Dispatch of British troops to Germany . . . . .	456
27 July. Capture of Louisbourg . . . . .	457
Supremacy of Pitt . . . . .	458
1759. Renewal by French of schemes of invasion . . . . .	459
July-Aug. The British forces in Germany; battle of Minden . . . . .	460
Aug. Boscawen destroys the French fleet under De la Clue . . . . .	460
Conduct of Lord George Sackville . . . . .	462
26 June. Siege of Quebec by Saunders and Wolfe . . . . .	463
13 Sept. Victory and death of Wolfe . . . . .	466

# CONTENTS OF THE NINTH VOLUME.

xix

	PAGE
20 Nov. Hawke's victory in Quiberon Bay . . . . .	469
21 Feb., 1760. A French force lands at Carrickfergus . . . . .	469
Pitt rejects overtures from France . . . . .	471
28 April. Defeat of General Murray before Quebec . . . . .	472
8 Sept. Montreal surrenders to Amherst . . . . .	473
1756-57. Clive in India . . . . .	473
23 June, 1757. Clive's victory at Plassey . . . . .	474
16 Feb., 1759. Admiral Pocock relieves Madras . . . . .	475
22 Jan., 1760. Eyre Coote's victory at Wandewash . . . . .	477
25 Oct. Death of George the Second . . . . .	477

## CHAPTER XXVIII.

### LITERATURE AND MANNERS.

Effects of the revolution upon literature . . . . .	479
Locke's philosophy and the inductive period of Newton . . . . .	479
Systems affiliated to or opposed to Locke . . . . .	480
Locke's influence on theology; the Bangorian contro- versy . . . . .	480
The Deists . . . . .	481
Introduction of the historic method into theological speculation . . . . .	482
Addison and literary style . . . . .	482
Pope . . . . .	483
The mock-heroic; Swift . . . . .	483
Ethical and didactic poetry . . . . .	484
Translations; lyrical poetry; political ballads . . . . .	485
Epigrams; hymns . . . . .	486
Political plays and satires; caricatures . . . . .	487
The drama and its censors . . . . .	488
Opera; actors and actresses . . . . .	489
Tales of adventure . . . . .	490
Novels . . . . .	491
Periodical essays; the coffee-houses . . . . .	491
Newspapers . . . . .	493
The position of authors . . . . .	494
Letter-writing; the "grand tour" . . . . .	495
Italian influence on taste; gardening . . . . .	495
Painting . . . . .	496
Sculpture and architecture . . . . .	497
Scholarship and science . . . . .	498
The episcopal bench and learning . . . . .	499
Commerce and industry . . . . .	500
Costume . . . . .	501
Criminals; the services; social habits . . . . .	502

## APPENDIX I.

ON AUTHORITIES. . . . .	502
-------------------------	-----

## APPENDIX II.

	PAGE
ADMINISTRATIONS, 1702-1760 . . . . .	517

## MAPS.

(AT THE END OF THE VOLUME.)

- Plan of the Battle of Blenheim, August 13, 1704.
- Plan of the Battle of Ramillies, May 23, 1706.
- Plan of the Battle of Oudenarde, July 11, 1708.
- Plan of the Battle of Malplaquet, September 11, 1709.
- Plan of the Battle of Dettingen, June 27, 1743.
- Plan of the Battle of Fontenoy, May 11, 1745.
- Eastern and Central America, 1755.
- India in the time of Queen Anne.

[Dates of events in England prior to January 1, 1752, are given in the Old Style, eleven days later than the New Style current in Scotland and on the Continent, except Russia; but the year is taken as beginning on January 1, not on March 25. Dates of events abroad are given either in the New Style or else with the double figures of the Old and New Styles, as July 12/23 (p. 12).]



## CHAPTER I.

### THE GRAND ALLIANCE.

ANNE ascended the throne with little schooling in politics save that of the nature of backstairs intrigue. During the life of her sister there had been constant friction arising from the hostile attitude to the court of her favourite Lady Marlborough. When Mary died William had the good sense to recognise the impolicy of maintaining an estrangement with the principal personage in the realm after himself. Yet the reconciliation was little more than formal. The king was himself too jealous of power to share even the semblance of it with another, and so far was he from affording Anne an opportunity of education in public policy that no communications were made to her by ministers of the course of affairs. It was enough for her that her favourite's husband, the Earl of Marlborough, whose military talent he appreciated, but whose tortuous politics he had reason to distrust, held the highest commands. A princess of intellectual force, whose succession was assured, could not have submitted to this exclusion from influence. It was assisted by the divided sympathies of the circle of which she was the centre. Lord Godolphin, her friend from early years, was of the party to which the name of tory was beginning to be applied. Marlborough's predilections were in the same direction, but his wife, who outside military affairs exercised an absolute power over him, was steeped in whig principles.

Anne's little court, therefore, while a rendezvous for all who harboured personal discontents, never became a centre of political opposition. It was known, indeed, that her sympathies favoured the tories, but this was not a proof of identity of

CHAP.  
I.

CHAP. I. political principle. She generally applied to the tories the name of the Church party, and her ecclesiastical prepossessions formed the link between them. Nevertheless she could not shut her eyes to the fact that the more extreme among the tories would have displaced her for her half-brother, and she was keenly appreciative of the dignity of sovereignty. She was aware that a far greater number were secretly hostile to the acts of succession, and her attachment to the Church was stronger than the tie of blood, as to which she affected incredulity. Her speech to the privy council upon the day of King William's death and her first speech as queen both insisted upon her political detachment, and were at least in part inspired, as a letter of her own tells us,<sup>1</sup> by whig politicians.

Anne's physical characteristics have been handed down to us by the brush of Kneller. Her face was heavy but not unpleasant, her forehead good, her lower jaw large and sensuous. However facile to her female favourites, she had in matters of state a strong sense of the homage due to her. It was their failure to render this homage which she alleged as her reason for the dismissal of Sunderland and Harley, and even her lifelong friend Godolphin. This feeling led her to resent intrusive criticism and encouraged her at last to throw off the dominance of the Duchess of Marlborough. If considerations of state compelled her tolerance of statesmen distasteful to her, she concealed, though she seldom conquered, her antipathy. As, however, she detested scenes, she was content to await her chance of release. She was popular for the same reason that George III. was popular, as the embodiment of the homely virtues.

By a statute of 1696<sup>2</sup> it was provided that the parliament in existence at the king's death should assemble forthwith and continue for six months. The two houses accordingly met on the third day after the king's death, Wednesday, March 11, 1702. Anne went to the house of lords in state and delivered a speech in which she affirmed her intention to stand by the allies and "to reduce the exorbitant power of France<sup>3</sup>". Such a declaration was imperative to check the dismay with which the news of the king's death had been

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 8th Rep., 1881, App., p. 53.

<sup>2</sup> 7 & 8 W. III., c. 15.

received at Vienna and the Hague. Her first public appearance as queen was more than a *succès d'estime*. She had, at the desire of Charles II., taken lessons in elocution from the actress Mrs. Barry. She possessed, records Burnet, "softness of voice and sweetness in the pronunciation". "I have heard," says Oldmixon, "the queen speak from the throne. I never saw an audience more affected : it was a sort of charm." Her natural bashfulness covered her with blushes, and the jest ran round the coffee-houses that she was like the sign of the Rose and Crown.

CHAP.  
1.

Acting doubtless on the advice of the Marlboroughs, the queen, within two days of her accession, dispatched circular letters to foreign powers affirming her resolution "to maintain the alliances against France". Marlborough himself was accredited with the same assurances to the States-general. Anne had assuredly no idea of surrounding herself with purely party advisers. The necessities of foreign policy might well justify a hope on the part of the whigs of enjoying a controlling voice in her councils. The Duke of Devonshire was appointed lord steward, and a number of other whigs continued in their posts. The nominations of Godolphin as lord treasurer, and of the Earl of Marlborough as captain-general, were followed by promises of support by the whig leaders ; for Godolphin was notoriously an opportunist, whose party feeling was of the most lukewarm description, and Marlborough was universally recognised as the most competent person for military command. But although Marlborough's mission to Holland lasted only a few days, in that short interval another influence began to make itself felt.

Laurence Hyde, Earl of Rochester, the younger son of the Lord Chancellor Clarendon, uncle of the queen, and the lord-lieutenant of Ireland, was at this time in London. He had been an agent of the tyrannies of James II., and was in disposition the counterpart of that king. To the whig pamphleteers he was the type of mischievous bigotry. He seized the occasion of Marlborough's absence to engross the queen's ear. The effect of his counsels was first made apparent in a number of court appointments announced on April 14. Among these the most obnoxious to the whigs was that of Sir Edward Seymour to the post of comptroller of the household. He

CHAP. I. was now sworn of the privy council, and with him, as privy seal, John Sheffield, Marquis of Normanby, next year created Duke of Buckinghamshire, but generally known by the title of Buckingham. The Earls of Nottingham and Jersey and a group of politicians who, in the words of the Duchess of Marlborough, "had all a wonderful zeal for the Church," also received nominations. Nor was this enough. Two leading whig statesmen were not ordered to be sworn on the new privy council: Somers, who represented in the eyes of Rochester, still a Jacobite at heart, the hateful principles of the revolution; and Halifax, who in the previous year had been impeached by the house of commons. Sir Charles Hedges, a cipher dependent upon Rochester, was once more appointed secretary of state, with another former secretary, the Earl of Nottingham, as his colleague (May 2). Nottingham was scarcely the man to whom to entrust the fortunes of continental campaigns. He had, it is true, some culture, but his disposition was towards a narrow clericalism and his temper so gloomy that he went by the nickname of "Dismal". In the council he supported Rochester's inclination for peace. On the side of an energetic prosecution of the war on the continent stood Marlborough and Godolphin, supported by the whigs in council and by the whig majority in the house of lords.

The queen's coronation took place on St. George's day, April 23, Dr. John Sharp, Archbishop of York, who had ousted Tenison as principal clerical adviser, being selected by her as preacher. The ceremony was marked by the introduction of the declaration against transubstantiation, framed with the intention of excluding Roman catholics from the throne. The coronation oath, established by Parliament in 1689 instead of expressing a general adhesion to ancient laws and institutions, specifically pledged the sovereign to observe parliamentary statutes and to maintain the "protestant reformed religion established by law". The remaining life of parliament was chiefly spent in a series of duels between the two parties in the house of lords, for which the pamphleteers of the day furnished occasion. The whig majority carried orders for the prosecution of pamphlets, written in the tory interest, suggesting designs on the part of the whigs against the queen's accession. They also avenged themselves on the Church party

for the recent court appointments by ordering to be burnt by the hangman a sermon preached by Dr. William Binckes, proctor for the diocese of Lichfield, before the lower house of convocation on January 30, 1704, the anniversary of the execution of Charles I., in which there was a comparison, declared by their resolution to have given "just scandal and offence to all Christian people," between Charles and the founder of the Christian religion. A favourite whig project emerged from royal speeches into an act of parliament empowering the queen to appoint commissioners to treat with Scotland for a union. On the other hand, the tories were gratified by an act for the examination of the public accounts, out of which they hoped to extract matter incriminating of peculation the whig financiers of the late reign.

CHAP.  
1.

But in this expiring parliament the most momentous incident was the declaration of war against France and Spain on May 4. Apart from the obligations entailed by William III., statesmen were confronted with the dangers of both a naval and military supremacy, and the consequences to the trade of the country were plain enough. France under Colbert had become closed against English goods, and English ships visited French ports frequently in ballast. Spain had hitherto remained comparatively open. England and Holland competed with France in supplying her with industrial products, the tariff being in some particulars favourable to the two maritime powers. In accordance with the prevalent economic theory, they believed their trade to be all the more profitable in that Spanish exports were inferior in value, and the differences were consequently met by exports of the precious metals of which the plethora was ruining Spain.

Nor was the Spanish market the sole concern of the maritime powers. Spain shared to the full the superstition of the colonial system. The colonial ports of Spain were closed to the traders of other nations, though between the Dutch and English West India settlements on the one hand and the Spanish mainland on the other there existed a vigorous system of smuggling which the Spanish navy in its decay was unable to suppress. Both the English and Dutch settlements were productive communities. They furnished the north of Europe with sugar, and had everything to fear from a loss of naval

CHAP. I. supremacy by the maritime powers. On the mainland, English colonists raised in Virginia and Carolina the tobacco they exported to Europe. New England was already alarmed at the progress of the French arms in Canada. The English government was anxious for the control of the mouth of the St. Lawrence and the safety of its fishing settlements. It was evident to the maritime powers that the supremacy of the united French and Spanish navies would rob them of their most profitable sources of wealth, as well in the New World as in the Mediterranean. Already the French had established control of Spanish politics. French mercantilism, enforced by the joint action of Spain with France, threatening Dutch and English trade at all points, was a menace to their very existence as European powers of the first rank. The queen's speech (May 4, O.S.), announcing the declaration of war, sought to enlist the sympathies of the moneyed interest by insisting upon the commercial importance of the issues. It added the grievance of Louis XIV.'s recognition of the pretender's title to the throne.

While Louis had been prompt to discern that the peace party among the Dutch would demand a reconsideration of the obligations subsisting at William's death, the assurances of Marlborough, whose talents as a diplomatist matched his military skill, served to confirm the general disposition to adhere to the Orange policy of the Grand Alliance. At the helm of foreign affairs was the Grand Pensionary Heinsius. Heinsius had been Dutch ambassador to France, and, formerly in opposition, had of late supported William III. Heinsius and Marlborough, both William's political pupils, were at one in the view that war was inevitable, and that it was to be prosecuted with energy. Of the two, the horizon within the vision of Heinsius was the more contracted. His absorbing object was the security of his country from invasion. Its traditional safeguard was the occupation by Dutch troops of the imperial fortresses of the Flemish and Belgian frontiers, commonly known as "The Barrier".

The queen's declaration of war recited the "solemn treaties of alliance with the Emperor, the States-general of the United Provinces, and other princes and potentates". Upon the condition of the court of Vienna we have ample in-

formation from the dispatches of our ambassador, George Stepney, who enjoyed the credit of being the only Englishman of the period conversant with the ramifications of German politics. The Emperor (Leopold I.) was but the ghost of a great name. As an ally he could supply men, collected at great distances from the theatre of operations, but organisation, leadership, and capacity had long disappeared from the Austrian army. Such was the financial chaos that, in the words of the Venetian envoy, "the officials live without salary, the troops without bread, the workmen without pay".<sup>1</sup> The position of the emperor was made worse by the outbreak in 1701 of an insurrection in Hungary, provoked by infractions of the Hungarian constitution and by persecution of the protestants. A Hungarian revolt, headed by Francis Rakoczy, and aided by officers and money supplied by Louis XIV., threatened, in combination with the hostility of Bavaria, to strike the empire at the heart.

CHAP.  
I.

The numerous states forming the Germanic empire were torn with dissensions and animated only by common jealousy of the emperor. Their forces if united would have been overwhelming; the more considerable among them, such as the Elector of Bavaria or the King of Prussia, might well turn the scale. Prussia had lately emerged from insignificance under the leadership of Frederick William, the "Great Elector". In military strength it now took rank as the first of the secondary powers with a standing army of 43,000 men. There were, indeed, other suitors than the allies at the Prussian court. But Prussia wanted money, and neither Poland nor Sweden could furnish subsidies. The combination of feudal obligation and financial interest proved decisive. On December 30, 1701, Frederick I. of Prussia had entered the Grand Alliance. Louis XIV.'s patronage of the pretender left Hanover no doubt as to its course. The majority of the other German princes supported the emperor. On the other side were the two brother princes of the house of Wittelsbach, the Electors of Cologne and Bavaria. Max Emanuel, Elector of Bavaria, was the most powerful of the southern German sovereigns. His jealousy of the emperor led him to support Louis XIV. as the

<sup>1</sup> Von Arneth, *Oesterr. Geschichts Quellen*, xxii., "Relation des Daniel Dolfin vom Jahre 1708".

CHAP. I. friend of the autonomy of the German states, and the French king dangled before his eyes the prospect of an independent crown. In the extreme north the efforts of the French to organise a confederacy had been frustrated. Its centre was to have been the duchy of Brunswick - Wolfenbüttel, but on March 20, 1702, a sudden surprise from Hanover compelled the reigning duke to range his forces with the emperor. The northernmost representative of the French interest was the Duke of Holstein-Gottorp, behind whom loomed the dreaded form of his brother-in-law, Charles XII. of Sweden, whose policy was as yet uncertain. The duke was kept in check by his rival, the King of Denmark, who offered to furnish the allies with troops.

The conventions entered into by William III. placed some 232,000 soldiers at the disposal of the Alliance. In the event of a declaration of war by the German diet this number was to be raised to 360,000 men. But no dependence could be placed on the emperor.<sup>1</sup> He promised 130,650 men for the Austrian contingent of 1702. All he could muster was some 40,000 men for Italy and about 20,000 for the Upper Rhine. The French standing army, on the other hand, was estimated at 205,300 men, of whom at least 130,000 could be brought into the field. To this must be added 25,000 men raised in the Spanish Netherlands, 8,000 Spanish troops in Milan, 15,000 auxiliaries from the Duke of Savoy, and 25,000 Bavarians under the elector, Max Emanuel. At the outbreak of the war in 1702 the troops at the disposal of France outnumbered the effective forces of the Grand Alliance by about 30,000 men. Of these the greater part, amounting to nearly 90,000, were in the Netherlands. The French forces stretched from the sea to Bonn on the Rhine. Their most vulnerable points were the sea-coast on one side and the territory of the Elector of Cologne on the other. Brabant was covered by fortifications extending over a wide area; Ostend, Ghent, Bruges, and Mechlin were protected by lines of defence. With the exception of Maestricht, into which Ginkel, Earl of Ath-

<sup>1</sup> G. Stepney to the Emperor, April 18, 1703: "Il stato delle truppe che vostra Maestà pretendeva havere in Italia per l'imminente campagna; il qua stato parve à prima vista magnifico sopra il foglio ma," etc. *Buccleuch* (Montagu House) MSS., ii., 2, 655, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 1903.



lone had thrown 12,000 men, the fortresses on the Upper Meuse were in French hands. CHAP.  
I.

On July 2 Marlborough, who since the end of May had been at the Hague concerting a plan of campaign, joined the main army, then posted along the Waal between Nimeguen and Fort Schenck. His nomination to the chief command had not passed uncontested. The general sense was that he owed it not to his merits, but to diplomatic necessities. This feeling impaired his authority with the representatives of the States-general and encouraged a captious jealousy among his disappointed rivals, especially the King of Prussia and several of the Dutch generals. He was further hampered by the presence with the army of a number of Dutch "field-deputies," a body of inexpert civilians whose approval of his plans it was needful to obtain.

With Nimeguen as his headquarters Marlborough found himself at the head of 60,000 men. His intention had been to march into Brabant, but the Dutch generals refused to expose the Rhine and Nimeguen without authority from the States-general, and the States-general indorsed their view. Marlborough was therefore forced to resort to a compromise, and agreed to leave twenty squadrons of horse and eighteen battalions of foot to intrench themselves before Nimeguen. By a series of strategic marches he compelled the French to abandon the course of the Meuse. The river was lined with fortresses which impeded the navigation, injured the commercial interests of the Dutch and threatened their very doors. As the allies, whose military operations had chiefly consisted in sieges, were indisposed to accept Marlborough's advice and attack the enemy in the open field, it was agreed to undertake the siege of Venloo. An outlying fort defending Venloo was captured on September 18, N.S., by an intrepid assault led by Lord Cutts who, for the "joy of battle" that he shewed under fire, had earned the nickname of "the salamander". "But he lost the honour," says Burnet,<sup>1</sup> "that was due to many brave actions of his, by talking too much of them." On the 23rd the town capitulated, the garrison marching out with the honours of war. Stephanswerth and Roermond on the Meuse fell in succession. Marlborough

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. of His Own Time*, ed. Oxford, 1833, bk. vii., vol. v., p. 31.

CHAP. then "extorted the consent of the States" to the reduction of  
I. Liège, which commanded the navigation of the Meuse above Maestricht. Liège fell the last week of October and the allies found themselves in possession of the fortresses of the Meuse from Huy to the sea.

With the capture of Liège Marlborough concluded a campaign, satisfactory enough to the Dutch, but falling far short of the programme he had designed and the opportunities he had been compelled to forgo. On November 3, accompanied by the Dutch field-deputies, he left Maestricht for the Hague, descending the Meuse in a boat with a guard of twenty-five men. A French guerrilla force seized the tow rope and captured the boat. The Dutch deputies had taken the precaution to furnish themselves with French passes. Marlborough was without one, but a servant named Gell, happening to have in his pocket a pass which had been granted to the earl's brother, General Churchill, who had left the army on sick furlough, slipped it into his hand. His captors were probably unable to read, and the earl's face being unknown to them, the party were suffered to proceed.

His return was welcomed by the Dutch with enthusiasm. Success had invested him with the moral authority lacking before. "The success of this campaign," the Earl of Athlone acknowledged, "is solely due to this incomparable chief, since I confess that I, serving as second in command, opposed in all circumstances his opinion and proposals." Public opinion at home indorsed this judgement. The queen offered Marlborough a dukedom. With characteristic caution his countess expressed a disinclination to accept the title "until we have a better estate". A promise from the queen to endow it with £5,000 a year from the post office during her life prevailed upon him to accept it. He was created Marquis of Blandford and Duke of Marlborough. But the general election of August had returned the tory party with a majority of two to one in the house of commons, and the tories were resolved upon retaliation for the inquiry into the conduct of their favourite, Admiral Sir George Rooke. Even an official like Sir Christopher Musgrave, clerk of the ordnance,<sup>1</sup> and therefore Marlborough's

<sup>1</sup> This is not mentioned in his biography in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, but see Record Office, MS., State Papers, Anne, bundle 1, no. 52, June 6, 1702.

subordinate, denounced the proposed grant. The queen, at Marlborough's instance, withdrew the message recommending it, and his wife even declined an offer of £2,000 a year, from the privy purse, though after her disgrace, nine years later, she claimed and received it as a grant actually made.

During the operations in the Netherlands the emperor had not been inactive. He entertained a strong desire to recover for the empire Alsace and the fortress of Landau which had been left in possession of France by the peace of Ryswick. Before Catinat and Villars could concert its relief Landau fell on September 9. The Elector of Bavaria, who had long amused the court of Vienna with futile negotiations, now threw off the mask. On the 10th his troops suddenly occupied the imperial city of Ulm on the Danube. The princes of the empire at the diet of Regensburg thereupon declared war against France and her allies.

From the first threatening of hostilities the tories had favoured operations in the peninsula, in which the fleet would necessarily bear a large part, rather than a campaign in the Netherlands.<sup>1</sup> The nearest base was Portugal, and Portugal was anxious to avoid participation in the quarrel. The English government was conscious that to coerce Portugal into co-operation against Spain would be useless unless a candidate could be found for the Spanish crown. Nevertheless the emperor, whose desires were set upon the acquisition of Naples, had turned a deaf ear to the proposal of Heinsius in the spring of 1702, though supported by the English government, that his second son, the Archduke Charles, should claim in person the crown of Spain. The emperor's dream was to restore in himself the empire of Charles V., acquiring Spain for himself and his eldest son. But Portugal had no notion of assisting to make its neighbour at Madrid the most formidable monarch in Europe. The negotiations with Vienna were protracted till the late autumn of 1702, and England and Holland had already undertaken an expedition to Cadiz, while the preliminary step of the selection of a rival to the French candidate for the throne of Spain was as yet unsettled.

<sup>1</sup> Bonet, Jan. 25, 1701, Berlin State Archives, ap. Von Noorden, *Europäische Geschichte* (1870), i., 359.

CHAP.  
1.

During the winter of 1701-2 George, Prince of Hesse-Darmstadt, recently Viceroy of Catalonia, was the guest of William III. in London. Deposed by the government of Philip V. in February, 1701, he was accredited by the emperor to William III. as adviser upon the contemplated expedition to Spain. He maintained a correspondence with all the imperialist partisans in that country and generally inspired the allies in their Spanish policy. It was upon his recommendation that, shortly before William III.'s death, it was determined to undertake a joint sea and land expedition against Cadiz, the principal naval arsenal of Spain and the port of its transatlantic colonies. The fleet of the allies, which sailed from Spithead on July 12/23, 1702, consisted of fifty of the line, thirty English and twenty Dutch, ten frigates, fifty transports, and other ships, nearly 200 in all, under Admiral Sir George Rooke. The Duke of Ormonde, a soldier of experience, commanded the troops, consisting of a handful of dragoons, 7,100 foot, 2,400 marines, and 300 engineers and gunners with twenty heavy guns, sixteen mortars, and ten field-pieces.<sup>1</sup> There was also a Dutch contingent of 4,000 men. The instructions to Rooke were "to reduce and take the town and island of Cadiz," or if this were impracticable, "to proceed to Gibraltar or take on your way home Vigo, Ponte Vedra, Corunna or any other place belonging to Spain or France". After the capture of Cadiz or Gibraltar he was to dispatch a squadron and 2,000 troops to the West Indies. The real object of the capture of Cadiz was to make it a naval base for operations against Toulon, whereby to obtain command of the Mediterranean. Cadiz was defended by nine regiments of foot, 1,000 horse, and a coast-guard of militia. In the harbour, which was obstructed by a chain boom, were seven French men-of-war and eight galleys. The defence was entrusted to a skilful soldier, the Marquis de Villadarias, who had already earned a reputation by his defence of Charleroi against the French in 1693.

On arriving before Cadiz, Ormonde was for landing the

<sup>1</sup> "The Duke of Ormonde told me," writes Burnet, "he had not half the ammunition that was necessary for the taking Cadiz, if they had defended themselves well." This is to some extent corroborated by an official letter from the office of ordnance to Prince George of Denmark, lord high admiral, of June 6, 1702. See R.O., MS., State Papers, Anne, bundle 1, no. 52.

troops under cover of a bombardment by the fleet, and capturing the town by assault. Rooke insisted on the strength of the garrison, and the inability of the fleet to render effective aid if it should come on to blow. He proposed instead the capture of Port St. Mary, slightly inland and on the other side of the bay, as well as the coast town of Rota, still more to the west, and the fort of Santa Catalina. The expedition against Cadiz thereupon degenerated into a predatory foray among sea-side villages. Soldiers and sailors plundered Port St. Mary, even robbing the churches, a pastime in which Lord Nugent's Irish "Rapparees," as they were called, specially distinguished themselves.<sup>1</sup> Prince George, whose mission was to conciliate the Andalusians,<sup>2</sup> dispatched a complaint to Vienna, implicating in this orgy of plunder Sir Henry Bellasis, second in command of the army. At the same time he addressed to Rooke, who was suffering from gout, and from the first had no heart in the expedition, a protest stating in plain terms that "the methods which have been taken hitherto seem not directed to do anything but to find out some pretence, after some unanswerable delays, to go with the first fair wind for England". Nevertheless, Rooke and the other admirals were unanimous in deciding against an attempt upon any other Spanish port, a proposal on which the military opinion was divided, Ormonde and both the Dutch generals recommending a fresh adventure. On September 9, N.S., the expedition sailed for England, Prince George in disgust retiring to Portugal.

In London the street ballads were already besmirching Rooke as an incapable coward.<sup>3</sup> He owed the rescue of his naval reputation to a fortunate accident. On October 3 Captain Wishart, with a detachment of the fleet, put into Lagos to water, the admiral continuing his homeward course. At Lagos, Wishart heard a report of the arrival at Vigo of the French admiral, Château-Réault, conveying Spanish trea-

<sup>1</sup> O'Nija to Ormonde, Lisbon, Oct. 23, 1702, *Ormonde MSS.*, p. 766, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 7th Rep., App.

<sup>2</sup> He accompanied the expedition as representative of the emperor to receive such Spaniards as were disposed to declare themselves "as good subjects of the emperor, which might be of good example and influence other places too". Nottingham to Ormonde, June 25, O.S., 1702, *ibid.*, p. 763.

<sup>3</sup> Letter of Bonet, the Prussian Resident, November 21, 1702, Von Noorden, *l.*, 304, n. 2.

CHAP. I. sure galleons from the West Indies. At once sailing after Rooke, on the 17th Wishart overtook him with the intelligence. Rooke knew in July that the treasure ships were on the way. As a matter of fact, the admiralty had already sent him a dispatch, which had not yet reached him, ordering their interception. It had also commissioned Sir Clowdisley Shovell with a fleet, which had left England on October 4, to watch for them off the west coast of France. Rooke was ill and indisposed to attack, but the Dutch admiral, Van Almonde, insisted. On October 11-22 the fleets came to anchor off Vigo Bay. Rooke being confined to his bed, the attack was in the hands of Vice-Admiral Hopsonn. The seventeen galleons within the harbour were protected by a boom, by two batteries of twenty and forty guns respectively, and by sixteen French and three Spanish ships of the line. The attack was begun on October 23, N.S., by Ormonde, who, having landed in command of 2,500 troops, took the larger battery by assault. Hopsonn, in his ship, the *Torbay*, broke the boom, captured or destroyed almost the entire hostile fleets, and secured a booty to the value of about £1,000,000. The victory eclipsed the failure of Cadiz.

Simultaneously with the expedition to Cadiz, a squadron under Vice-Admiral Benbow was operating in the West Indies. His force consisted of seven ships, and on July 11, 1702, he sailed from Port Royal in Jamaica with the object of intercepting the French admiral Ducasse, who was conveying the Duke of Albuquerque, the new Spanish viceroy of Mexico, to his government. Benbow engaged in a running fight for six days; but four of his captains having given him very inadequate assistance and finally refusing further to support him, he was obliged to draw off, having lost a leg in the action. On his return to Jamaica he ordered the four captains to be tried by court-martial for cowardice, breach of orders, and neglect of duty. Two of them were condemned to death and were shot at Plymouth in the following April; the third was cashiered, the fourth died before trial. Benbow himself died on November 4, 1702, partly of his wounds, partly of disappointment in having been frustrated, as he declared, in the total destruction of the French squadron.

A treaty with the Dutch for the reinforcement of the army

in the Netherlands by 11,000 men, including four regiments of English infantry, having been signed on March 12, 1703, N.S., the enlistment of troops in Germany began forthwith. Boufflers had now been joined by the more enterprising Villeroy, but the instructions of the French commanders were to wage a defensive campaign upon the Lower Rhine. The main action of the French was reserved for the Upper Rhine. Boufflers and Villeroy, therefore, with no more than 37,000 men, intrenched themselves behind the Mehaigne. Antwerp and Bruges were covered by two corps, together 10,000 men, under the Spanish general, the Marquis Bedmar and Count de la Mothe. Marlborough opened his second campaign with a heavy heart, for on February 20 he had lost his only surviving son, Lord Blandford. He outnumbered the French by 30,000 men, and his desire was to attack the French army in the field. The Dutch adhered to their creed that the object of war was the capture of fortresses.

CHAP.  
I.

It was apparent to Marlborough that some more energetic action must be taken against the French than a mere succession of sieges in the Netherlands. During some months the emperor had been making urgent representations to the English government that the French army of the Upper Rhine and the Elector of Bavaria were meditating a campaign which should end in Vienna itself. But the nervousness of the Dutch for their own frontier and Marlborough's restricted powers made help for the present impossible. All that could be done was to effect a diversion to the west so menacing that the French would be obliged to reinforce their army from the Upper Rhine. In the event of a marked success Marlborough hoped to be able to spare some reinforcements for the imperialists, and for their aid on the Upper Rhine he at once detached twenty battalions and eight squadrons of horse. During a month after the reduction of Bonn on May 15, 1703, Marlborough, encamped upon the Meuse, was concerting with Heinsius a plan of operations which he cloaked with the phrase, "our great design". Great importance was attached in England to the capture of the seaports held by the French, above all Antwerp and Ostend, and the consequent revival of English trade. Marlborough's plan was to converge upon the French lines in Flanders from three directions. But the "great design" mis-

CHAP. I. carried through the disobedience to orders of the Dutch commanders. The Dutch general Opdam rashly attacking the French lines was routed at Eckeren on June 26, and Marlborough became the butt of the Dutch pamphleteers. His jealousy of the Dutch generals and his new-fangled and incompetent strategy were believed to have combined to bring about the disaster.

Marlborough soon felt the effects of this state of public opinion. His friend and supporter, the Grand Pensionary Heinsius, dared not incur the responsibility of authorising an attack projected by him upon the French lines before Antwerp. He reverted, therefore, to his former plan of preparing the way for a campaign on the Moselle in the following year. He marched back to the Meuse and on August 7-16 invested Huy, a fortress important as covering Liège and commanding the navigation of the river. After the capture of Huy, which held out only a few days, Marlborough, again anxious to meet and crush the French army by his superior numbers, proposed an attack on the yet unfinished intrenchments of Villeroy and Boufflers behind the Mehaigne. But the Dutch field-deputies positively forbade the enterprise, and Marlborough was compelled to content himself with a protest to the States-general. The capture of Limburg and Guelders in the autumn ended the campaign of 1703. It had lacked brilliancy, and had been accompanied by one disaster. Its main success had been the reduction of Spanish Guelderland, which relieved the Dutch from apprehension of an inroad on that side. On the other hand, Villeroy and Boufflers had fulfilled their instructions, and by occupying a series of defensive positions had kept the superior numbers of the allies at bay.

While in the west the French had maintained the defensive throughout the campaign of 1703, they had laid their plans for a concerted attack by their army of the Upper Rhine and that of the Elector of Bavaria upon Suabia, Franconia, and Austria itself. In this they were to be aided by offensive diversions from Piedmont upon the emperor's possessions in North Italy and in the east by the Hungarian insurgents. At the beginning of the campaign the army of Villars, who had replaced Catinat, numbered 60,000 men and a reinforcement of 30,000 men was promised. The Elector of Bavaria was at the head of 40,000



regulars and several thousand militia. Opposed to the army of Villars was Louis, Margrave of Baden. At the head of no more than 10,000 men the margrave was unable to offer effective resistance to the advance of Villars at the end of February, 1703, and could only look on from behind his intrenchments when that general took possession of Kehl, the key to Southern Germany. Even in April reinforcements, among them 6,000 Dutch, had only brought up his army to 20,000 troops. Villars, with 70,000 French and Bavarians, proposed to march on Vienna, a daring enterprise that had many prospects of success. But the Elector of Bavaria, like the Dutch, was careful for his own frontier. CHAP.  
I.

After ceaseless recriminations between the two, Villars threw up his command in the middle of October, 1703. His successor was Count Marsin. The French army of the Middle Rhine under Marshal Tallard had lain inactive during the summer, ready to furnish reinforcements as they might be needed, either on the west or east. With the surrender of Landau to the French on November 17, their position on the Middle Rhine greatly improved. The campaign of 1703 closed in this neighbourhood under circumstances of great depression for the allies. Despite the heavy subsidies of the maritime powers, the margrave's army was reported by the English representative, Davenant, to be holding its intrenchments with no more than three rounds a man.<sup>1</sup> The South German princes shewed signs of wavering; the Duke of Würtemberg began to talk of a reconciliation with victorious France.

The Duchy of Savoy, including Piedmont, occupied a position between two great powers, France on the one side, on the other Austria, in respect to the imperial possessions in North Italy. The policy of the dukes had, therefore, necessarily been a continual balancing. At the opening of the war of the Spanish succession the reigning duke, Victor Amadeus II., appeared doubly committed to France. His eldest daughter, Marie Adelaide, had married the Duke of Burgundy, Louis XIV.'s grandson. His second daughter had recently (1701) become the wife of Philip, Duke of Anjou, the Bourbon candidate for the throne of Spain. But though Victor Amadeus

<sup>1</sup> It had been reduced to one round per man. Davenant to the Secretary of State, January 20, 1704, R.O., MS., Von Noorden, i., 451.

CHAP. L had by treaty strengthened these ties, he had been alienated by the menaces and insolence of the French generals during the Italian campaign of 1701, which finally drove him into the arms of the allies. By a treaty signed at Turin on October 25, 1703, the duke came into the Grand Alliance on the terms of an extension of territory at the expense of Milan and Mantua, the assistance of 20,000 imperial troops, to be under his command, and the maintenance of the Piedmontese army by the maritime powers. In England the adhesion of the duke was acclaimed both as a blow to Louis XIV. from within his own family circle and because it facilitated projects long under consideration of invading the south of France.

The Tories had continued to insist on the doctrine that England should play only a subordinate part by land. They still hoped that their favourite commander, Rooke, might eclipse the struggling fortunes of Marlborough. The country had made great efforts. A total of 256 ships of war had been equipped, among them 94 of the line with 64 to 100 guns. But, with the exception of the affair at Vigo, the performances of the navy had hitherto been ineffective. The most recent failure was that of Vice-Admiral Graydon, who, having at the beginning of 1703 been dispatched with five ships to reduce the French colony of Placentia in Newfoundland, had returned home without attacking either the place or a French squadron of four ships which he had passed on the way.

The unreadiness of the Dutch naval preparations also involved England in difficulties. The emperor's dominant wish was to secure Naples for the house of Habsburg before attempting Spain.<sup>1</sup> In the spring of 1702 England, to whom the Spanish succession was the paramount interest, had refused a fleet for this purpose. But the importance of effecting a diversion in Italy was presently perceived and the co-operation of a fleet was promised for the following year.<sup>2</sup> May, 1703, came<sup>3</sup> and Stepney was still pledging his word to the impatient

<sup>1</sup>G. Stepney to Shrewsbury, May 1-12, 1703: "We shall never bring these people seriously to think of Spain before we are masters of Naples and Sicily". *Bucleuch MSS.*, ii., 2, 657.

<sup>2</sup>April 19, 1702. Home Office Admiralty, 10. J. S. Corbett, *England in the Mediterranean* (1904), ii., 201.

<sup>3</sup>Stepney to the Emperor, April 7-18, 1703: "Verso la fine del mese di Maggio" *Bucleuch MSS.*, ii., 2, 655. These repeated delays must have been

emperor that the allied fleet should appear in the Mediterranean by the end of June. But the Dutch had again failed to keep their promises, and without reinforcements no sufficient force could be spared for so distant a service. When the Dutch fleet arrived in England at the end of June, Rooke was offered the chief command. On his declining it as "too small for his character," Sir Cloudisley Shovell, an admiral belonging to the whig party, which, since Prince George of Denmark had been at the head of the admiralty, had been largely excluded from promotion, was nominated to the command of the division of the fleet destined for the Mediterranean. Rooke with the main fleet was to clear the Channel. Something, the government felt, must be done to redeem the series of naval miscarriages which had followed Vigo. But there was little time to effect anything. English and Dutch admirals alike were nervous about bringing a first-class fleet into the Channel late in the year. The instructions of the admiralty to Shovell were that he was to be on his way home, westwards of the Straits of Gibraltar, by the end of September. Within that time he was to convoy a number of merchant vessels to Portugal, to induce the Barbary states to commit hostilities upon the French marine, to supply arms and munitions of war to the insurgents in Languedoc, to rouse the east of Spain to declare against the Bourbon claimant, Philip V., to exact satisfaction from the Grand Duke of Tuscany for alleged injuries to English merchants at Leghorn, to excite an insurrection in Sicily, and to protect the communications of Prince Eugene by clearing the Adriatic of a French squadron. He protested, as well he might, that impossibilities were asked of him. Stepney had pledged himself to the emperor that the fleet should spend two months at Naples alone.<sup>1</sup> The admiralty, however, refused to vary their orders, and Shovell set sail from St. Helen's in the Isle of Wight on July 1, 1703, with a fleet of thirty-five English and seventeen Dutch men-of-war. The Dutch were commanded by Van Almonde, the hero of Vigo.

the more galling to Stepney after he had roundly taken the emperor to task on the subject of preparations at the end of April. *Buccleuch MSS.*, ii., 657.

<sup>1</sup> G. Stepney to the Emperor, April 7-18, 1703: "Per secondare durante due mesi intieri li disegni della vostra Augustissima: Casa sopra quel Regno". *Ibid.*, p. 655.

## CHAP.

## I.

Shovell did his best to fulfil as many of his multifarious instructions as he reasonably could hope, but was obliged to put back by storms, and it was the middle of July before he had finally left England. Having discharged his convoy at Lisbon, he sailed to the Barbary coast, where he met with hostility. Thence he made Altea, on the coast of Valencia in Spain, where he was well received by the population.<sup>1</sup> Here the fleet distributed proclamations in favour of the Archduke Charles, by the title of Charles III., and proceeded to Leghorn, where it arrived on September 26–October 6, 1703.<sup>2</sup> The Dutch were reluctant to go so far, and in a hurry to start homewards.<sup>3</sup> All that Shovell could do was to deliver an ultimatum<sup>4</sup> to the Grand Duke of Tuscany, and after a week's stay set sail for home (October 2-13). On his way westwards he endeavoured to fulfil another item of his instructions, that of supplying arms and munitions to the insurgents of the Cevennes, whose heroic resistance to religious persecution had excited a warm sympathy in Holland and England. By July, 1703, the insurrection had, after twelve months, grown to such proportions that with substantial aid from the maritime powers the south-east of France might have been ablaze. That aid it was impossible to render for want of a naval base.

The importance of the accession of Victor Amadeus to the Grand Alliance lay in this, that the capture of Toulon by the concerted attack of a Piedmontese army on the land side, and an English and Dutch fleet from the sea, would enable the combined fleet to winter in the Mediterranean, would maintain the communications between Vienna and the imperial armies in Italy, would decide Venice in favour of the allies,<sup>5</sup> and would deprive France of her southern naval arsenal. Lastly, the success of the Cevennois would have had its effect upon the Spanish war. The coast of Languedoc was inhabited by a

<sup>1</sup> Sir C. Shovell to Shrewsbury, September 29, O.S., 1703: "They seem to be unanimous for the house of Austria, and declared they don't believe that there are 100 men in the whole kingdom of Valencia that are for the Duke of Anjou's being their king". *Buckleuch MSS.*, ii., 681.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 679.

<sup>3</sup> Sir C. Shovell to Shrewsbury, September 29, O.S., 1703, *ibid.*, p. 681.

<sup>4</sup> Sir C. Shovell to the Grand Duke, October 2-13, 1703, *ibid.*, p. 682.

<sup>5</sup> G. Stepney to Secretary Sir C. Hedges, October, 16-27, 1703, Vienna, *ibid.*, pp. 685-86.

Catalan population, and Catalonia was traditionally hostile to Castile. For the present, despite all these fair prospects, there was little enough in Shovell's power to do. He detached two frigates "with a good quantity of arms, ammunition, and money". Their signals to the shore were not answered, for the envoys entrusted with the secret had been arrested on crossing the frontier.<sup>1</sup>

CHAP.  
I.

Shovell arrived in the Downs a few days before "the Great Storm" of November 26, 1703, in which four of his ships were driven from their anchors, though none of them was lost. It was a disastrous night for the navy, which sustained a total loss of seventeen ships, 618 guns and 1,500 seamen, including Rear-Admiral Beaumont. On shore many lost their lives, among them Richard Kidder, Bishop of Bath and Wells, and his wife, crushed by the fall of a stack of chimneys at the palace of Wells. Immense devastation was wrought in our woods. John Evelyn in his *Sylva*, records that the New Forest lost 4,000 large trees and he himself about 2,000.

Observers abroad as well as the English ministry were deceived by the opposition shown by political parties in Spain to the supremacy of French influence. Well-disposed persons plied them with pleasing intelligence. Sir Lambert Blackwell, our minister at Florence, wrote to Shrewsbury that at the Spanish seaports "the people talk of a change, being all ripe for it".<sup>2</sup> The Genoese envoy at Madrid declared that most Spaniards would welcome the intervention of the Portuguese.<sup>3</sup> The Aragonese and Catalans, reported Blackwell, were demanding confirmation of their privileges and were "ripe for rebellion".<sup>4</sup> This last information was true enough, save that they were not for rebellion in the Austrian interest so much as against the pompous misgovernment of Castile. The emperor's correspondents confirmed the delusion. Towards the end of October, 1702, an event occurred which strengthened these prepossessions. The Duke of Riosecco, great admiral of Castile, foremost in rank and wealth among the Spanish

<sup>1</sup> Anonymous to Sir Lambert Blackwell, Genoa, November 6-17, 1703, *Buccleuch MSS.*, ii., 688.

<sup>2</sup> July 13-24, 1703, Florence, *ibid.*, p. 667.

<sup>3</sup> Blackwell to Shrewsbury, August 10-21, 1703, Florence, *ibid.*, p. 672.

<sup>4</sup> Blackwell to Shrewsbury, June 22-July 3, 1703, Florence, *ibid.*, p. 661.

CHAP. I. grandees, accredited by Philip V. ambassador to Versailles, made his way to Lisbon and declared for the allies. He had been long a friend of Prince George of Hesse-Darmstadt, the most efficient agent of England in Spain. He announced, to the satisfaction of Portugal and the allies, his intention of putting himself at the head of a Portuguese army for the purpose of seating the Archduke Charles, as Charles III., on the throne of Spain.

This declaration settled the policy of the maritime powers. It was no longer a question of the emperor's claims. The maladroitness by which, as the whigs complained, the landing at Cadiz had been made in the name of the emperor, had justly provoked the resistance of the Andalusian nationalists.<sup>1</sup> It was determined to enter into a treaty with the Portuguese court, to which a French plenipotentiary was already making overtures for a renewal of the alliances with Louis XIV. Courted by all sides Pedro II. raised his terms. On May 16, 1703, a treaty was concluded by Paul Methuen, the resident British minister, eminently favourable to Portugal and no less disadvantageous to the maritime powers. Portugal was to supply 28,000 troops, of whom 13,000 were to be maintained and paid by the maritime powers. An auxiliary force of 12,000 Dutch and English veterans was to be landed in Portugal, a squadron was to protect Portuguese harbours and, like the land forces, to be under the command of the king. The object of the alliance was declared to be the acquisition by Charles III. of the whole Spanish monarchy. The emperor, after making some difficulties, inspired by desire for the Spanish dominions in Italy, agreed to renounce in favour of the archduke the kingdom of Spain and "the kingdoms belonging thereto," which he considered involved a reservation of the Milanese and the Spanish Netherlands. Queen Anne in return declared her willingness to bind herself to the exclusion of the house of Bourbon from every portion of the Spanish monarchy; but this pledge was never committed to a formal document, an omission upon which, at a later date, another ministry had reason to congratulate itself.

The Archduke Charles, the emperor's favourite son, was at

<sup>1</sup> Bonet, October 20, 1702, Prussian State Archives, Von Noorden, i., 389.

this time eighteen years of age. He is described as of good proportions and of pleasing presence. He was conscientious, temperate, and fond of study. But he had no origina- tive capacity, and was dependent upon his governor, Prince Antony of Liechtenstein, who, both tactless and overbearing, was ready to sacrifice a kingdom to a point of etiquette. So averse was the Emperor Leopold from parting with him that his presence in Portugal was made an article of the treaty, and one which was not signed without a marked reluctance.<sup>1</sup> Even then the emperor had not abandoned his desire that the archduke's first step should be to establish himself in Naples and Sicily,<sup>2</sup> which were, the court of Vienna was assured, "ready to catch so soon as the fleet arrives,"<sup>3</sup> that is, the expected fleet of Sir Clowdisley Shovell. Stepney was instructed, therefore, to insist that the archduke should at once proceed to Holland and embark there.<sup>4</sup> Charles arrived at the Hague on November 3. Having landed at Portsmouth on January 7, 1704, he was received with distinction by the queen at Windsor as King of Spain. He left England on the 17th, sailing aboard Rooke's flagship to Lisbon, accompanied by an armada amounting in all to 188 ships. At Lisbon the allies discovered that the Portuguese troops were ill-trained, ill-clothed, and ill-armed; that they were short of horses, and their fortresses in neglect.

The English ministry seized the opportunity to indemnify the nation for the additional sacrifices it was now called upon to make. John Methuen, father of the resident and ex-lord chancellor of Ireland, was dispatched to Portugal, and on December 16-27, 1703, concluded the agreement known to fame as "the Methuen treaty". The object of this treaty was twofold—to give England a monopoly for her woollen goods in the Portuguese markets, and to injure the French by granting preferential duties to imported Portuguese wines. These were to be admitted at a third less duty than wines from France. The treaty was agreeable to the governing

<sup>1</sup> Stepney to Shrewsbury, *ubi supra*; Stepney to the Emperor, July 3-14, Vienna, *Buccleuch MSS.*, ii., 2, 663.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Stepney to Shrewsbury, July 24-August 4, Vienna, *ibid.*, p. 669.

<sup>4</sup> Stepney to the Emperor, July 3-14, 1703, Vienna; Stepney to Shrewsbury, July 10-21, Vienna, *ibid.*, p. 665.

CHAP. I. classes of both countries. The great landowners of Portugal foresaw a rise in the price of their wines; the great landowners of England increased profits from their wool; the merchants an active exchange; the shippers profitable freights. Nor was the effect of the treaty so complete a revolution in English taste as has generally been supposed. That had already begun to conform to the exigencies of war. Between 1675 and 1696 England had imported from France a yearly average of about 15,000 tuns of wine, as contrasted with 300 tuns from Portugal. During the war with France in 1689-97 the import from Portugal rose to 9,459 tuns, an evidence that taste was already beginning to change. It must be remembered also that Portuguese wines were cheaper, especially relatively to alcoholic strength, than the wines of France. After the Methuen treaty, from 1704 to 1712, England consumed 118,908 tuns of Portuguese wine, while the import from France remained almost at the level of ten years earlier, *viz.*, 16,553 tuns. The treaty, though advantageous while the French market remained closed proved eventually productive of the ill-effects which invariably result from the interference of governments with the course of trade. England found herself hampered for many years to come in the extension of her commercial relations over the far more profitable market of France. The treaty marked a change in the attitude of English parties to the war. The tories began to open their eyes to the commercial possibilities to be derived from a conflict they deplored. In this spirit they resolved to accept the enlargement of the area of the struggle.



## CHAPTER II.

### HOME POLITICS.

THE last parliament of William III. had been dissolved on July 2, 1702. The general election resulted in a majority for the tory party of nearly two to one, the popularity of the queen and the activity of the clergy being powerful in their favour.<sup>1</sup> To these causes may be added, as Burnet admits, "the conceit, which had been infused and propagated with much industry, that the whigs had charged the nation with great taxes, of which a large share had been devoured by themselves". On the other hand, the whigs issued a "black list" of 167 tory members of the last parliament, whom they denounced as friends of France. The result was that the tories, as a whole, in order to clear themselves from this imputation, emphatically pledged themselves to support the war. Outside this pledge, as Burnet says, the tories were "full of fury against the late king and against those who had been employed by him". Parliament met on October 21, and Robert Harley was again chosen speaker. The temper of their house shewed itself in the commons' address. They congratulated the queen that "the wonderful progress of your majesty's arms, under the conduct of the Earl of Marlborough, has signally retrieved the ancient honour and glory of the English nation". The word "retrieved" was, and was intended to be, a reflexion upon William III. As such it was challenged by the whigs, and "maintained" was proposed as an amendment. The strength of parties was tested by the division. A majority of 180 to 80 voted in favour of "retrieved". Among them were "all who

CHAP.  
II.

<sup>1</sup> Lord Keeper Sir Nathan Wright to [Thomas Coke], July 25, 1702: "The elections hitherto give hopes of a true Church of England parliament". *Cowper MSS.*, iii., 14, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 12th Rep., App., pt. iii.

CHAP. had any favour at court or hoped for any". The satirist Walsh  
11. summed up the controversy in the lines—

Commanders shall be praised at William's cost,  
And honour be retrieved before 'tis lost.

The demand by an extraordinary mission from Holland for an increase of the 40,000 men voted for the war in the Netherlands afforded an opportunity for gratifying a resentment of long standing entertained by the commercial classes against the Dutch. Since the beginning of the war England had prohibited all direct trade with France. The emperor and the German princes had agreed to follow her example. But Amsterdam was the financial clearing-house of Europe. The vote for an additional 10,000 men was carried through the house of commons on January 5, 1703, by a majority of 71, the friends of Marlborough and Godolphin voting with the whig party. But it was coupled with the condition "that there be an immediate stop put to all commerce and correspondence with France and Spain on the part of the States-General".

The news of the exploit at Vigo, which did not arrive till after the opening of the new parliament on October 21, 1702, supplied the tories, among whom Rooke sat as member for Portsmouth, with a set-off to the success of Marlborough, who, enjoying the support of the whigs as the representative of William's continental policy, was already obnoxious to the majority. On November 12 the queen went in state to St. Paul's to return thanks "for the signal success of her arms under the Earl of Marlborough and the Duke of Ormonde and of her fleet under Sir George Rooke". The three commanders received the thanks of the houses, and Sir George was sworn of the privy council. The Duke of Ormonde, nevertheless, indignant against Rooke as the author of what the commons, in their address to the queen upon the opening of parliament, styled the "late disappointment at Cadiz," saw an opportunity of inflicting a rebuff on Marlborough's rival in glory. The whig majority in the lords readily agreed to his motion to appoint a committee to examine Rooke's instructions and the conduct of the expedition. Rooke vindicated his conduct with audacity. He censured the plan of the expedition, which, it will be remembered, had been a whig project, and arraigned the instructions with which he was

furnished. Besides his political supporters in the ministry he had many friends. Speaker Onslow describes him as "more of a man of fashion and fitter for a court than any one almost of his profession". The lords rejected the adverse report of its own committee, and a resolution was carried "that Sir George Rooke had done his duty, pursuant to the councils of war, like a brave officer, to the honour of the British nation" (February 17, 1703).

CHAP.  
II.

The bitterness of this indirect reprimand to Ormonde was assuaged by his appointment to the lord-lieutenancy of Ireland. The vacancy had been created by the resignation of Rochester, who had displeased the queen by inspiring the opposition in the house of commons to her offer of a pension to Marlborough. Commanded by the queen, on the advice of Godolphin, his opponent in the cabinet, to proceed to Ireland, he refused to obey. His insolence provoked Anne to "order that he should no longer be summoned" to meetings of the council, and his influence at court was for a while eclipsed. Between the queen and the whig leaders friction presently arose on a domestic question. Anne was devoted to her husband, Prince George of Denmark, and was anxious that parliament should make a provision for him in the event of her death suitable to the relief of a sovereign. How, a tory with a caustic wit, who had already irritated the whigs by an adulatory address presented by him from Gloucestershire, reflecting scandalously on the memory of King William, was entrusted with the measure. On November 21, 1702, he proposed £100,000 a year which, it was remarked, was double what any Queen of England ever had in jointure. The demand was an example of the mischief of the dependence of ministers upon the will of the sovereign. No one ventured to oppose it on the ground of its extravagance, both parties being alike anxious to conciliate the queen. But the bill offered the tories an opportunity of gratifying their hatred of the foreigners who had been advanced by William III. It was moved that a clause be inserted in the bill excepting the prince from any disabilities imposed on aliens by the Act of Succession. The motion was an ingenious attempt to assign a retrospective interpretation to disabilities which had, in fact, been imposed to prevent the grant of lands or offices to foreigners by future sovereigns. In the upper

CHAP. II. house sat a small body of peers of foreign extraction who had under William III. rendered meritorious services to their adopted country: William Bentinck, Earl of Portland, whose counsels were still sought by the chiefs of the whigs; Arnold-Joost van Keppel, Earl of Albemarle, who had commanded the Dutch contingent of the allies in 1689-97; William Nassau-Zulestein, Earl of Rochford; Henry Nassau-Auverquerque, Earl of Grantham, and Meinhart Schomberg, Duke of Schomberg, an English general, son of the Marshal Schomberg who fell at the Boyne, and whose Latin epitaph in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, is a record of the greatness of the father, of the meanness of the son, and of the mordancy of the pen of Swift.

Against the insidious clause which indirectly threatened their estates and appointments, two constitutional objections were raised. The first was that it was a tack upon a money bill. The subject of "tacks" was already a sore point between the two houses, for it was evident that if tacking became a practice, and the lords had no alternative but the acceptance or rejection of a bill *en bloc* as a money bill, they would cease to exercise any legislative power. They had, therefore, recently agreed upon a resolution that they would pass no money bill sent up by the commons to which any clause was tacked that was foreign to the bill. And in this case, a clause making no similar provision for other peers similarly circumstanced suggested the interpretation of the act of succession aimed at by the tories. Anne regarded the opposition as a personal slight and pressed the whole bill "with the greatest earnestness that she had ever yet shown in any thing whatever". She was zealously aided by the Marlboroughs and their friends, anxious to prove gratitude for recent favours. But they could not control their son-in-law, the Earl of Sunderland, a whig of impracticable temper. He became one of the leaders of the opposition to the bill, disliked even by independent peers as establishing a precedent for degradation from the peerage. Nothing could have saved the bill in the lords but the opinion given by the judges that the foreign peers could not be dispossessed of their rights. The bill passed by a narrow majority, but protests against the clause were signed by most of the whig leaders, among them

Sunderland, Somers, Portland, Manchester, Rivers, Townshend, Wharton, and the Dukes of Somerset, Devonshire, and Bolton, as well as by six bishops and the Archbishop of Canterbury (January 19, 1703). Anne's wifely indignation nurtured a resentment against the signatories in general and Sunderland in particular, which at a later time she seized the opportunity to gratify.

While this bill was in debate a proposal still more menacing to the alien peers was made by Sir Edward Seymour, the comptroller of the household. Acts of resumption had been frequent during the middle ages, when for lack of ready money grants of crown lands were lavished upon hungry courtiers. "The exorbitant grants of William III.," as they were called in a popular pamphlet, were especially obnoxious as tending to an increase of the burdens laid upon Englishmen for the benefit of foreigners and for a war in which foreign interests were primarily concerned. On December 23, 1702, Seymour moved for leave to bring in a bill to "resume all the grants made in King William's reign and apply them to the use of the public". The whigs were rescued from an obvious dilemma by the adroitness of Robert Walpole. He moved an amendment, "that all the grants made in the reign of the late king James should also be resumed". The amendment was rejected, but the tories were conscious that their bid for popularity was trumped. Though they carried Seymour's motion by 180 to 78 votes, they judged it wise to drop the bill.

Foiled in their attacks on the favourites of the late king, the managers of the majority hoped for a more favourable issue from an appeal to the theological prejudices of the nation. Zealots for the Church combined with zealots for the supremacy of the tory party to concert a measure which should have the twofold effect of discouraging dissent and depressing the whig interest. The names of its authors disclose the mixed motives that inspired it. They were, on the one hand, William Bromley and Arthur Annesley, who sat for the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge respectively, and were, in effect, the representatives of the clergy, on the other, Henry St. John;—the missionaries of oneness of creed and the rejecter of all creeds alike. The traditional Anglican assumption had been the co-extensiveness of Church and

CHAP. II. State. That this conception was still in full vigour in the minds of the tory party is attested by the preamble of the act transferring first-fruits and tenths to the augmentation of small livings in which the parliament of 1703 addressed the queen as "the only supreme head on earth" of the Church of England.<sup>1</sup> To the disgust of the tories, a breach in this uniformity had been effected in favour of the dissenters by the toleration act of 1689. But the revolution had not repealed the corporation act of 1661 which made the taking of the sacrament the condition of holding an office in corporations, nor the test act of 1673 extending this condition to all servants of the crown whether civil or military. To those who refused this limited conformity all posts were closed. They were excluded from the government of the Bank, of the East India Company, and of all other corporate bodies.

As it was no longer punishable after 1689 to attend conventicles, and as the dissenters were, in the main, thriving tradesmen who naturally aspired to the distinctions of local government, there arose among them occasional conformists. These having complied with the law by taking the sacrament once and thereby qualified for civic office, thenceforth resumed their customary religious worship. Some there were to whom conformity was by no means repugnant on religious grounds. Occasional conformists, said Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, on the second reading of the bill of 1703, were "without number" in his diocese. Between these and the low churchmen, who sought to strengthen protestantism by enlarging its borders, there was a mutual sympathy. It was cemented by political partisanship. Both maintained the tradition of hostility to absolutism, whether in Church or State. Both, therefore, were to be found in the whig ranks.

On November 17, 1702, a bill to disqualify occasional conformists from office was read a second time in the house of commons. Whereas the corporation act of 1661 had only included persons "having employment relating to or concerning the government" of corporations, the new bill swept into its

<sup>1</sup> 2 & 3 Anne, c. 11.

<sup>2</sup> De Foe, writing to Harley on July 30, 1705, speaks of "the exceeding harmony between the dissenters and the low Church" in Dorset. *Portland MSS.*, iv., 213, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 1897.

net all the inferior officers or freemen in corporations, that is, a large number of those whose votes determined elections. Whereas hitherto a single act of conformity was sufficient, it was provided by the bill that any persons who, after taking the sacrament and test, attended any religious meeting, where five persons were present besides the family, should be disabled from their employments and fined £100, and £5 a day for every day in which they afterwards acted in such employments. They should also be incapacitated from holding any other employment until after a year's conformity to the Church, to be proved at quarter sessions. Upon a relapse, the penalties and the period of incapacity were to be doubled. The bill was carried through the commons by large majorities, composed of the tories and the court party, and reached the lords on December 2. CHAP.  
II.

Meanwhile, High Church fanaticism set the country aflame. The London mob committed outrages on the meeting-houses of the dissenters. The pamphleteers poured forth a stream of incitements to mischief. The preachers, prominent among them Henry Sacheverell, a fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, denounced those bishops who connived at the defilement of the temple. At the height of the excitement appeared an anonymous pamphlet, *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters*. The friends of the Church were conjured to seize the opportunity to extirpate the accursed dissenters with fire and sword. There were High Church fanatics, we know from contemporary evidence, who thought the satirical advice really admirable. But though it translated into plain words the inflammatory language of the pulpit and the press, it provoked a reaction in public feeling. The High Church party began to fear for the bill. A search was made by Lord Nottingham, as secretary of state, for the audacious pamphleteer. He proved to be Daniel De Foe, himself a dissenter, who had been employed by William III., had satirised both tories and whigs, and had recently denounced occasional conformity as hypocrisy. He was tried for seditious libel, fined £200 and put in the pillory. But his satire had had its effect. The sympathies of those who were not committed to either political party turned against the persecutors. De Foe's pillory was a triumph. The London mob, which had lately howled against dissenters,

CHAP. II. protected him from violence. He remained in prison from July, 1703, to August, 1704, when he was released by the intervention of Harley, whose confidential agent he became.<sup>1</sup>

In face of High Church zeal and of the pressure exerted by the queen, the whig majority in the lords lacked courage to throw out the bill directly. Supported by many of the Low Church bishops, at the head of whom was Bishop Burnet, they endeavoured to maim it by amendments. They inserted clauses protecting the members of the French and Walloon protestant congregations; they cut the heart out of it by excluding from its provisions the officials of corporations, and leaving it applicable only to officers of state, among whom dissent was unknown. But conscious that this vital amendment would not be accepted, they resorted to the artifice of provoking a constitutional struggle upon an incidental point. They amended the fines imposed by the bill. By this amendment the houses were brought to a direct issue on a constitutional question, for the commons "had of late set it up for a maxim that the lords could not alter the fines that they should fix in a bill, this being a meddling with money". To justify their action, therefore, the lords caused a search for precedents to be made in the Rolls of Parliament and conclusively established their right. The commons thereupon contented themselves with simply affirming their disagreement with the lords' amendments.

As neither side would give way upon the constitutional issue, a free conference of both houses met on January 16, 1703. The queen renewed her pressure in favour of the bill in its utmost severity. Her compliant husband, Prince George, had, on his appointment as lord high admiral on May 21, 1702, qualified himself by receiving the sacrament, yet he maintained a Lutheran chapel and was, therefore, himself an occasional conformist. As Duke of Cumberland he came down to the house to vote for the bill, but was reported to have whispered to Wharton, "My heart is vid you". The primate, Tenison, supported Burnet's eloquence in favour of tolerance, but the

<sup>1</sup> *Portland MSS.*, iv., 61, 68, 75. In Nov., 1703, Harley hinted to De Foe that there was some one of consequence interested in him. This appears to have been the queen herself, who made him a present in money at a time when Harley proposed to employ him as a secret agent at Hanover. De Foe to Harley, May (?), 1704, *ibid.*, pp. 87-89. Cf. *Blenheim MSS.*, p. 43, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 8th Rep., App.



issue of the division which took place in the lords after their retirement from the free conference was doubtful to the last. "On three questions put on different heads, the adhering (to their amendments) was carried by but one voice in every one of them, and it was a different person that gave it in all three divisions." The bill was therefore lost. It had excited interest in all the courts of Europe. The lords violated precedent by publishing the proceedings, which triumphantly established their vindication as the representatives of toleration and the champions of public liberty. They followed up their success by amending a tory bill for the relief of non-jurors who had not abjured the pretender within the time limited by the statute of 13 W. III. c. 6, and by inserting a clause extending in favour of the Electress Sophia and her heirs the penalty of high treason against any who should "endeavour to deprive or hinder" their succession.<sup>1</sup>

In the course of the last session of the expiring parliament of 1702 a bill had been passed for the appointment of commissioners for the examination of public accounts. That considerable confusion and public indebtedness had arisen during the last stormy reign was of common knowledge. In this matter the whigs were not forward to act, the administration of the finances having been largely in the hands of their political partisans, and six previous commissions having proved ineffective. Seven commissioners were nominated, all tories, of whom the most eminent was St. John. Their first inquiry was addressed to the accounts of the Earl of Ranelagh, who having been paymaster-general of the army during the reign of James II. had been continued in that office by William III. Ranelagh, an Irish peer of the whig party, a wit and a man of pleasure, had provoked jealousy and suspicion by the sumptuousness of his establishment and the extent of his gardens. Irregularities were proved, but there was no conclusive evidence of peculation. The commons, therefore, unable to order a criminal prosecution, passed a series of resolutions condemnatory of some of his transactions. But the practice of the retention of interest upon public moneys in the bank which had enriched Ranelagh, as it was not condemned by the house, was not discontinued.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Anne, st. 2, c. 21.

CHAP.  
II.

The tory commissioners next flew at higher game. Charles Montagu, Lord Halifax, the restorer of the currency, had exchanged the place of first commissioner of the treasury and a seat in the house of commons for the lucrative office of auditor of the exchequer in 1698 and a peerage in 1700. At the treasury he had been driven to the irregular expedients by which, when revenues were failing and credit was low, resources were found for an exhausting war. The disorder thus introduced into the finances was aggravated by practices like those admitted by Ranelagh. Numerous though the irregularities of his subordinates were proved to be, the commissioners failed to bring home corruption to Halifax himself. Nevertheless, they ordered a prosecution by the attorney-general. The conviction of Halifax, one of their most prominent leaders, would have been disastrous to the whigs. In anticipation of any judicial process, the house of lords had already summoned the commissioners of accounts before them on February 1. The commissioners having taken no notice of the summons, Halifax was heard on the following day. On February 5 the Duke of Somerset presented a report, which was agreed to by the lords, acquitting Halifax of the neglect and breach of trust imputed to him. These proceedings they ordered to be published.

Feeling between the two houses was now at fever heat. A war of retaliation was promised. The lords threatened the appointment of a committee to examine the accounts of tory officials. Among the most unpopular of these was Sir Edward Seymour. It was rumoured that he had never rendered an account of the office of treasurer of the navy, held by him from 1673 to 1681.<sup>1</sup> If this counter-campaign were pressed, no resource would remain to the tories but to influence the queen to dissolve parliament, and the whigs anticipated that the successes of Marlborough would be credited to their own account. Anne was therefore advised to close the session on February 28, 1703. The tories now felt assured of the court. But their ascendancy over the queen was of little effect so long as they were exposed to constant defeats in the house of lords, though, as has been seen, on some critical

<sup>1</sup> Bonet, March 23-April 3, 1703. Von Noorden, i., 320.

issues the majorities against them were extremely narrow. In order, therefore, to secure the upper house, the queen was persuaded to create four new tory peers. Yet the influence of the Duchess of Marlborough was sufficiently powerful, despite much opposition, to obtain a fifth peerage for a nominee of her own. John Hervey, a whig, father of the author of the *Memoirs of the Court of George II.*, was created Lord Hervey of Ickworth. The reinforcement of the tories in the lords amounted, therefore, to no more than three votes. The High Church party was gratified, the whigs rebuffed, and the queen's temper exhibited by the preferment to the deanery of Lichfield of the notorious Dr. William Binckes, whose sermon the house of lords had in the previous parliament ordered to be burnt.

CHAP.  
II.

The indecisive campaign in the Netherlands and the want of success in the rest of the vast theatre of war which marked the campaign of 1703 sharpened the hostility of the extreme tory party to Marlborough.<sup>1</sup> His foreign enterprises, they exclaimed, brought neither honour nor profit. In the house of lords Rochester, in the cabinet Nottingham, outside parliament the pamphleteers, were the spokesmen of this opinion. A sense of common interest was thus drawing together the fraction of the cabinet represented by Godolphin and Marlborough and the whig party. Godolphin had been strong enough in January, 1703, to check a tory crusade against whig officials by refusing his consent to the dismissal of those of the treasury. The conversation in whig circles began to turn upon the prospect of success in an attempt by Marlborough and Godolphin, with whig aid, to oust the extreme tories from the cabinet and to form a new ministerial body, if not whig, at least sympathetic with whig policy in foreign affairs.

Nottingham, Rochester's *alter ego* in the cabinet, thought, on the other hand, the time propitious for the renewal of Rochester's policy of "Thorough". In March, 1703, during the absence on the continent of Marlborough, who had defeated Rochester's proposal in the previous year, Nottingham induced the queen to dismiss a number of lords-lieutenant, sheriffs, and justices of the peace. These were not officials whom Godolphin was able to screen by an appeal to the exigencies

<sup>1</sup> Portland to Heinsius, December 23, 1703, *Heinsius' Archives*, Von Noorden, i., 353.

CHAP. of public business. But this reversal of the policy of William  
II. III. to exempt local administration from the vicissitudes of party politics provoked a reaction in public opinion and assisted the very object which Godolphin and Marlborough had in view. There was a general feeling expressed by the speaker, Harley, and by Halifax, who of all the whig leaders approached nearest in disposition to Halifax, the "Trimmer," that it was not for a patriotic Englishman to stir up domestic animosities while war was raging. The same sentiment inspired Davenant's *Essays on Peace at Home and War Abroad*, which, though published in the following year, were composed at this time. The Marlboroughs and Godolphin threatened resignation, and elicited from Anne one of those imploring remonstrances which are among the curiosities of literary correspondence. Nevertheless, in July, she refused to accede to the duchess's instances and to remove Nottingham. In foreign, as well as in domestic policy, his views and those of Godolphin were irreconcilable. Godolphin's correspondence shews the sympathy with which he followed the insurrection of the Camisards, as the Huguenot insurgents in the Cevennes were called, and his desire to aid it with an expedition. Despite Nottingham's opposition, he insisted, in July, 1703, on the dispatch of Richard Hill, a "Hanover tory," as the moderates of that party were now styled, to promote with that object the adhesion of the Duke of Savoy to the Grand Alliance. The high churchmen boasted that the opening of the autumn session of parliament would bring their revenge, and that Nottingham would, before many weeks were over, grasp the lord treasurer's staff.

On November 9, 1703, the queen opened parliament. The creation of new peers had emboldened the tories to a fresh bill against occasional conformity. But a change in the attitude of the court threatened them with another disappointment. The queen's speech had expressed an "earnest desire of seeing all my subjects in perfect peace and union among themselves". It was a hint of which the significance was unmistakeable when it became known that upon this occasion Prince George intended to let his heart so far control his head as to withdraw the support he had formerly given. Anne was torn between affection and bigotry. She shared the current anticipation that the indecision of the court would encourage the opposition to

the bill in the lords, and that, notwithstanding the new creations, another conflict between the two houses was likely to ensue. The opposition, as the tory leaders soon came to know, had been strengthened by the dismissals in the spring. The rejection of the bill by the lords became certain, notwithstanding it had been deemed prudent to modify its severity. It passed its third reading in the commons on December 7 by 223 to 140 votes. The high churchmen then proposed to tack it to a money bill. Marlborough knew that the temper of the whig peers was sufficiently roused to imperil the whole budget rather than give way upon a question which, presented to them in this shape, not only vexed their consciences but invited them to assist in the political annihilation of their house. He took care to let it be known that the queen disapproved of the project of a tack.<sup>1</sup>

The hint was enough. When the bill came up for second reading in the house of lords on the 14th, there was little formal criticism of its provisions such as had marked the debate of the previous year. Those who were willing to wound were no longer afraid to strike at the principle which the bill incorporated. The opposition was led by Burnet in an eloquent speech, one of the few examples of the oratory of the period which have come down to us, more nearly approaching the style of our own day than the declamation fashionable a century later. The bill was lost by a majority of twelve. Marlborough and Godolphin, while letting their friends know that they disapproved of the bill, voted for it and signed a protest against its rejection rather than risk loss of office. Their double dealing availed them little. They preserved the queen's favour, but they forfeited the confidence of the stronger men among whigs and tories alike.

Among the English Jacobites there was a general feeling that it would be unwise to attempt an insurrection in favour of the pretender so long as the queen lived. But it was debated whether, even during her lifetime, the pretender might not be able to establish himself in Scotland, where the Jacobites were far more numerous and powerful than in England. The prejudice against a legislative union with England, which was

<sup>1</sup> Portland to Heinsius, December 29, 1703, O.S., *Heinsius' Archives*, Von Noorden, i., 472.

CIIAP. now in contemplation, was likely to operate in favour of this  
II. design, and the succession to the crown of Scotland had not, as in the case of England, been determined by statute law. Emissaries began to renew their activity between England and St. Germain's, where Mary of Modena, James II.'s widow, still held court. Not a few of them earned secret service money from the English government for betraying the cause they professed to serve.

Among these intriguers one Simon Fraser of Beaufort, a highland chief, outlawed for abduction, made his way over to France in July, 1702. At interviews with Torcy, the French minister of foreign affairs, and even, as he alleged, with Louis XIV. himself, he concerted a rising in Scotland, to be supported by 5,000 French troops disembarking at Dundee. He himself received a commission as a colonel in the pretender's service. He returned to Scotland entrusted with a letter from the exiled queen, unaddressed, but expressing reliance upon the person for whom it was intended. This letter he himself addressed to the Marquis of Atholl, whose sister he had abducted, and who had been the promoter of his outlawry. He then carried it to the Duke of Queensberry, the queen's commissioner to the Scots parliament. Queensberry zealously reported to London this evidence of the treasonable intrigues of Atholl, his political opponent. The marquis retaliated by hastening to the presence of the queen and reading to her and the council for Scotland a memorial to the effect that Fraser was a confidential agent of Queensberry. Fraser, being denounced at the same time by a political adventurer, known to that generation as "Ferguson the Plotter," fled abroad. The Jacobites and their friends shrieked at the perfidy of a government which employed agents to tempt to treason. The ministry, on the other hand, were embarrassed. They did not wish to sacrifice Queensberry, and determined, therefore, to buy off by a distribution of honours the resentment of the Scottish peers implicated.

A suspicion grew among the English whigs that there was a design on the part of the ministry to hush up the whole intrigue, and Nottingham was thought to have supplied Atholl with information for his defence. Public apprehension having led to the arrest of several Jacobite agents early in December,

the whig leaders in the lords determined to sift the matter for themselves. They appointed a committee of seven of their number to examine Sir John Maclean, a Jacobite agent arrested on November 10, whose case at the time was still being investigated by Nottingham. An order was made that Maclean should be brought before the committee on the following day (December 14). The ministers then had recourse to the queen, who sent a message "that she thought it would be inconvenient to take it out of the method of examination it was now in". The lords were constrained to accept this answer. But their action was felt to have been a censure of Nottingham, and the high churchmen of the commons flew to his aid. An address of the house of commons to the queen on December 23, declaimed against the lords as guilty of an infringement of the prerogative. The quarrel involved a point of the highest constitutional importance. By their action the commons substituted for the system of conferences, by which the houses had been accustomed to adjust differences, an appeal direct to the crown as arbiter. Upon issues of this sort the lords enjoyed the incomparable advantage of the learning and the pen of Songers. In a masterly "representation to the queen" they vindicated their action on constitutional grounds. They also resumed their examination of Maclean, notwithstanding that Nottingham had put before them, together with the other papers, an abstract of his examination before the privy council, and had taken the further precaution of obtaining from the prisoner an acknowledgement that the abstract contained a full account of all he had said. The lords' committee, however, elicited much that was not contained in Nottingham's abstract which, they complained, "was both short and dark".

It was openly suggested that Nottingham was concealing some evidence, but a motion for the re-examination of Maclean as to what passed between Nottingham and himself was defeated by eleven votes on March 23, 1704. If we may trust a letter of Portland, dated January 1, 1703/4, there had been a suppression of grave importance. According to this, Maclean declared before the privy council, in presence of Marlborough himself, that both Marlborough and Godolphin had given assurances to the court of St. Germain's.<sup>1</sup> It is evident that Not-

<sup>1</sup> Portland to Heinsius, *Heinsius' Archives*, Von Noorden, I., 480.

CHAP. tingham, fearing that revelations of this kind would break up  
II. the ministry and bring the whigs into power, had, as the lords openly charged him, bought Maclean's silence. Maclean was released from the Tower on March 24, and received a pension of £500 a year during Anne's life.<sup>1</sup> The lords concluded their abortive inquiry with the resolution "that there had been dangerous plots between some in Scotland and the courts of France and St. Germain's, and that the encouragement of this plotting came from the not settling the succession to the crown of Scotland in the house of Hanover". This resolution they embodied in an address to the queen praying for a union between the two kingdoms. The exasperation of the baffled whigs disclosed itself in a second address on March 31 reflecting on the dismissals from the commission of the peace in the previous year, and expressing an opinion adverse to the nomination of former non-jurors. This the queen received with an unfavourable and evasive reply, pointed by the dismissal of Queensberry from most of his offices.

All these proceedings the lords committed to the press. Their action in taking public opinion into their confidence was a revival of the revolutionary practice of fifty years earlier, discountenanced since the restoration. It was distasteful to the tory majority in the commons, whose supporters were fewer among the reading public of the towns. But the pressure of the constituencies, more active under the system of triennial parliaments than it subsequently became, was so far felt that a proposal in November, 1703, to adopt the practice of the lords was only defeated by the casting vote of the speaker, Harley.<sup>2</sup> A perusal of the addresses and counter-addresses of the two houses reveals that at this time not merely literary ability but discerning and progressive statesmanship were to be found in the house of lords, which contained a considerable number of politicians of eminent service trained in the school of William III. There sat Portland, the late king's wisest counsellor; Somers, the acknowledged master of constitutional law; Godolphin, employed by all governments as the most skilful financier of the age; Halifax, the restorer of

<sup>1</sup> Macfarlane's *Genealogical Collections* (1750-51), i., 141, being, vol. xxxiii. of the Publications of the Scottish History Society (1900).

<sup>2</sup> L'Hermitage, November 27, 1703. Von Noorden, i., 483.



the currency; Burnet, a bishop who was also a statesman; and Marlborough, who had already won renown alike by his military talent and dexterous diplomacy. By the side of these, the Bromleys, the Hows, the Seymours of the lower house failed to strike public imagination, and St. John had scarcely risen to fame. In the commons the whigs enjoyed social as well as intellectual superiority. They scoffed at the corn-dealers and sheep-breeders who thronged the tory benches, strangers to the classics and ignorant of high politics, but responding with inarticulate docility to the crack of the High Church whip. CHAP  
II.

The irritation between the two houses resulting from the occasional conformity bill and the Scottish plot next found vent in a question affecting fundamental principles of the representative system. After the general election of 1702, the tory majority had dealt with notorious unfairness in the proceedings before the commons upon controverted elections. While these scandals were fresh in the public mind, the house of lords, in the case of an elector for Aylesbury, Ashby *versus* White, which came before it upon a writ of error, affirmed its jurisdiction to decide upon the right of the plaintiff to vote at an election to the house of commons. The decision reversed a judgement of the queen's bench, and was declared by the commons to involve a breach of their privileges. The lords in reply passed resolutions on March 27, 1704, against the pretension "to subject the property of Englishmen"—that is, the franchise—"to the arbitrary votes of the house of commons". To such a pitch had the animosity between the two houses now reached that the Prussian resident, Bonet, reported that an enterprising king had an excellent opportunity of ridding himself of parliament altogether.<sup>1</sup> It was carried into every detail of parliamentary business. When the tory majority in the commons, in order to screen Rook, sought to impute to Sir Cloudisley Shovell the futility of the last year's naval expedition, the peers took Shovell under their protection and appointed a committee of inquiry into the administration of the admiralty. They addressed the queen for the removal of the Jacobite Vice-Admiral Graydon for his recent misconduct

<sup>1</sup> Bonet, January 21-February 1, 1704, Von Noorden, i., 495.

CHAP. in not engaging Ducasse's squadron and for illegally press-  
II. ing men from merchant vessels in Jamaica. They vindicated the whig Admiral Russell, Earl of Orford, from a charge of peculation brought against him by the tory commissioners of public accounts.

One more constitutional conflict remained to be fought. The commons, at the close of March, sent up a bill to the lords for the continuance of the commission for the examination of public accounts. But the commission had rendered itself so odious to the whigs that it was determined to wreck it. Sunderland, Marlborough's son-in-law, whose whiggism was of an uncompromising aggressiveness, disinterred a precedent of Charles II.'s time to prove that the peers not only enjoyed the right to reject in such a case the nominees of the commons, but to substitute nominees of their own, which they did accordingly. The commons protested, and on April 3 a stormy conference of the two houses took place. Words were running high when Black Rod knocked at the door with a message from the queen. The ministry in alarm had advised an instant prorogation, and the commission of public accounts ceased to be.

It had become evident to Godolphin and Marlborough that if they hoped to maintain themselves in power they must be secured against treachery from within the ministry. Upon the most urgent questions of foreign and domestic policy Nottingham was at issue with both. Nottingham himself was so far unconscious of the insecurity of his position that he demanded the dismissal from the privy council of the whig Dukes of Somerset and Devonshire, with whom he had come into violent collision in the affair of the Scottish plot. The queen instead of striking the dukes off the list of the privy council, dismissed Lord Jersey, the lord chamberlain, who was under the imputation of Jacobitism, and Sir Edward Seymour, who had been Nottingham's lieutenant in the matter of the dismissal of whig justices of the peace. Seymour had given affront, not only by intemperate attacks on Godolphin, but by an announcement of his intention to renew the attempt at "tacking" the occasional conformity bill in the following session. Nottingham, not unnaturally conceiving the dismissal of Seymour to be a rebuff to himself, sent in his resignation in May, 1704.

Robert Harley, who had first been elected speaker in the

last parliament of William III., was designated by public opinion as the representative in the commons of that middle party which Godolphin and Marlborough were seeking to gather round them. He was acceptable to the clergy, and had received an address from them for the part he had taken in the promotion of the act for restoring to the Church the first-fruits and tenths. While leaning to the side of the tories, he had acted the part of a peacemaker in the quarrels between the houses. He had kept Godolphin constantly acquainted with the cabals of Nottingham. So great was the reliance placed by Godolphin and Marlborough on his management of the commons that it had been arranged by Godolphin, with the assent of Marlborough,<sup>1</sup> early in November, 1703, that the three "should meet regularly at least twice a week, if not oftener, to advise upon everything that shall occur".<sup>2</sup> It was not long before the three were known by the nickname of "the triumvirate".<sup>3</sup> Harley, who was at this time forty years of age, was the son of a country gentleman who had sat in parliament for Herefordshire and had fought for it during the civil war. Revolting from the military government of Cromwell, the father had welcomed the restoration, but he had armed for the Prince of Orange.<sup>4</sup> It was his political lot always to find himself between two fires, and while for his conduct in the convention parliament he was denounced as "an enemy to the Church," his opposition to the policy of William III. "drew upon him and his family the implacable rage of the Lord Wharton, Lord Somers, and the other whigs of their party".<sup>5</sup>

This detachment from party ties was improved by his son Robert Harley into a useful talent. When William III. approached the opposition he twice offered Harley a secretaryship of state. Harley's refusal increased his "great reputation among the country party," and his election as speaker in the new parliament of December, 1701, was opposed by the whigs. But his moderation gave so much satisfaction to all parties that in Anne's first parliament he was re-elected without op-

<sup>1</sup> Marlborough to Harley, October 11, N.S., 1703, *Bath MSS.* i., 56, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 1904.

<sup>2</sup> Godolphin to Harley, November 4, 1703, *Portland MSS.*, iv., 75.

<sup>3</sup> De Foe to Harley, November 2, 1704, *ibid.*, p. 147.

<sup>4</sup> See Auditor Harley's Life of the Earl of Oxford, *ibid.*, v., 643.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 645.

CHAP. position. He had the credit, according to the Prussian  
II. minister,<sup>1</sup> of being the most moderate man in the tory party. Brought up in close touch with the dissenters, his father having been an occasional member of Baxter's congregation, he always cultivated friendly relations with them. He was punctilious in religious observances, and, like Pepys, held family prayers, except when overcome by the bottle.<sup>2</sup> He was an opportunist by temperament, with a natural preference for the backstairs. This disposition had been remarked before his election to the speakership, and had earned him the nickname of "Robin the Trickster". During his tenure of the speakership his disposition to intrigue took the form of management. In this his talents had been so conspicuous that, at the time at which he entered Godolphin's ministry, he had surrounded himself with a group of followers composed from both parties.<sup>3</sup> The inscrutableness ascribed to him by his friends was sedulously cultivated by Harley. His naturally heavy manner, his involved and oracular utterances were the appropriate equipment of an enigmatic politician whose justly acquired reputation for knowledge of principles and precedents lent substance to mystery. His scheme of politics floated upon the personal favour of the sovereign which should submerge party divisions in a flowing tide of loyalty. By universal consent, he had too much good nature in his disposition to take any pleasure in political animosities.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Spanheim, May 30, 1704, Prussian State Archives, Von Noorden, i., 501, n. 4.

<sup>2</sup> That he had a dislike to latitudinarianism appears from the draught of an anonymous letter addressed by him to Archbishop Tenison, at some time between 1701 and 1705, accusing the archbishop of being under the influence of Socinians, Arians, and Deists. *Bath MSS.*, i., 52.

<sup>3</sup> Stanley West to Robert Harley, August 29, 1704, *Portland MSS.*, iv., 118

<sup>4</sup> The tributes to Harley's good nature paid by his correspondents are so frequent, and in one case that we know of so well founded, that it must have been a leading feature of his character. The Earl of Inchiquin, his schoolfellow, wrote to a cousin of his own: "He (Harley) always showed abundance of good nature and affability" (*Portland MSS.*, v., 64). "Your lordship's generosity," wrote a correspondent after Harley had broken with Marlborough, "is much commended at camp for carrying on the building of Blenheim with so much diligence; this is heaping coals of fire on their heads" (July 3-14, 1711, *ibid.*, p. 28). Bolingbroke, apologising for a letter in which he took his chief to task for mismanagement of business, says: "If you forgive the length of this letter and yet think that the worst part of it, you will be that great and that good-natured man I always took you for" (July 27, 1713, *ibid.*, p. 311).

Such was the new secretary of state. He undertook the northern department of foreign affairs, Hedges being transferred to Nottingham's former department, the southern. As an inducement to his acceptance of office, provision was made for two of his friends. Mansell, member for Glamorganshire, "the heir of a very considerable family in Wales," was made comptroller of the household in place of Sir Edward Seymour, and Henry St. John, secretary at war, in place of William Blathwayt. The office of lord chamberlain, which had been held by the Jacobite Earl of Jersey, was given to Henry Grey, Earl of Kent, a wealthy peer of a somewhat colourless whiggism.

St. John, then in his twenty-sixth year, had received the usual education of a man of fashion. He had been at Eton and had made the *grand tour*. Addicted though he was to bouts of drink and debauchery, he had an exceptional capacity for affairs, a sound memory, and remarkable brilliancy of expression. He had acquired some acquaintance with classical authors, appreciated good literature, and was familiar with current philosophical thought. These tastes introduced him to the foremost writers of the day. Destined by training and position to a seat in the house of commons, which he entered for the first time as member for the family borough of Wootton Bassett in the parliament which met in February, 1701, he elected to gratify ambition at the cost of such convictions as he had. Upon the tory benches a meagre handful of second-rate speakers struggled feebly against King, the future chancellor, Jekyll, afterwards master of the rolls, and Cowper, who, in the opinion of Burnet, "spoke the best of any in the house of commons". St. John, though a professed freethinker, discerned where lay his opportunity and ranged himself with the High Church party. As leading member of the commission on public accounts he conducted a crusade against one after another of the whig officials. He thundered against the financial proposals of Godolphin and lent eloquent voice to the murmurs of the inarticulate country squires in whose eyes the malt tax and the land tax obscured the glory to be derived from continental wars. They welcomed as their salvation the torrential eloquence and the aggressive wit of their youthful champion which overwhelmed by audacity the more restrained oratory of

CHAP. the elder parliamentarians.<sup>1</sup> Not one of his speeches has been  
 II. preserved to us, but as to their effect in the house his contemporaries are unanimous. Every High Church coffee-house rang with his praises. Dissipation, frivolity, scepticism were alike condoned when the talents they marred yoked themselves to the service of orthodoxy.

That a young man of these powers should be left to weld the opposition into an effective fighting force was agreeable neither to Godolphin nor to Marlborough. The duke discerned that at heart St. John was a political adventurer who, like a medieval *condottiere*, swore fealty to the side that had most to promise. Harley had not failed to establish friendly, indeed affectionate, relations with this rising sun. To St. John, Harley was for long "dear master," and the pupil, Harley's "affectionate Harry". Marlborough, perhaps impressed by St. John's financial talent, perhaps anxious to silence his diatribes against the continental policy, recommended him to Godolphin as secretary at war, despite the warnings of the duchess who saw how slightly the ties of friendship or political alliance would control his ambition. For a while, however, the influence of the duke dominated both Harley and St. John, the master and the pupil. The new secretary at war had not been many days in office<sup>2</sup> before his former friends perceived with disgust that the muzzle of promotion had moderated his tone. In a few months he was described by the Prussian resident as a warm admirer of the duke and absolutely dependent upon him. Unhappily for Godolphin, the changes in the ministry pleased neither tories nor whigs. The tories were disposed to look upon Harley and St. John as renegades. The extreme whigs were indignant that Marlborough's son-in-law Sunderland, a fighting politician, had not been put in the place of Nottingham. Sunderland, however, had been distasteful to the queen since his opposition to the bill for Prince George's annuity. An attack on the ministry by the whigs, it was thought,<sup>3</sup> might be supported by the extreme tories. During the anxious weeks of the summer of 1704,

<sup>1</sup> Bonet, April 18, 1704, Prussian State Archives, Von Noorden, i., 507, n.

<sup>2</sup> He kissed hands as secretary, April 4, 1704, *Cowper MSS.*, iii., 32.

<sup>3</sup> L'Hermitage to Heinsius, June 3, 1704, *Heinsius' Archives*, Von Noorden, i., 509.

when the British troops were marching eastwards to the succour of the emperor, Rochester and Seymour were declaiming against the waste of blood and treasure and threatening the impeachment of the duke.<sup>1</sup> The march to Blenheim was the ministry's last card.

CHAP.  
II.

<sup>1</sup> Bonet, June 13 and August 26, L'Hermitage, June 13, 1704, *Heinsius' Archives*, Von Noorden, i., 510.

## CHAPTER III.

### THE WAR AND PARTIES.

CHAP. FIVE weeks of the winter session of parliament had been  
III. spent by Marlborough at the Hague in preparation for the ensuing campaign. The prospect at the beginning of 1704 was by no means encouraging for the Grand Alliance. The empire was in a state of growing disorganisation. In the east the Hungarian insurgents under Rakoczy were raiding Silesia and Moravia, and alarming Vienna itself. On the other side of the frontier of Austria were the 45,000 troops of the Elector of Bavaria, extending along the Danube from Ulm to Linz, and maintaining communication with the Hungarians. To the west of the elector, on the Upper Rhine, was the army of Marshal Tallard. Menacing Austria from the south was the French army of Italy. The French plan of campaign was to unite these forces in co-operation for offensive action. Against them the emperor could only muster three inconsiderable armies, one operating unsuccessfully against the insurgents in Hungary, one of 20,000 men to oppose the Elector of Bavaria, and one ill-equipped force under the Margrave of Baden to hold the fortified lines guarding the passage of the Rhine at Stollhofen, in Baden. It had become clear to Marlborough in 1703 that the empire must be rescued or that the French would dictate peace at Vienna. Determined to disembarrass himself of the interference of the Dutch field-deputies, he had obtained from the States-general the title of commander-in-chief of the two maritime powers. The plan, or absence of plan, by which each power singly defended its own frontiers must, he resolved, be abandoned. The bait of petty advantages which distracted concert must be set aside, and a powerful combined movement, extending from the North Sea to the Danube, must achieve the expulsion of the French from Germany.



It was not, however, a moment at which Marlborough felt it would be wise to approach the Dutch with so vast a plan of campaign. The duke made up his mind, therefore, in the first place to take his measures in concert with Prince Eugene, the Austrian commander-in-chief, and to keep the Dutch ignorant of their full scope until the time came for their execution. Arriving at the Hague in the middle of January, 1704, he suggested a campaign on the Moselle with his own troops and some auxiliaries, while the Dutch under Ouwerkerk maintained the defensive in the Netherlands. These arrangements made, Marlborough returned to England at the close of February. It was necessary, at least, that he should impart his plans to the queen. The first object of the campaign was to crush the army of the Elector of Bavaria upon the Danube. In order to fortify his proposal, he induced the emperor to write a private letter to the queen, asking assistance. On April 2 another private appeal was made by the imperial minister. Marlborough thereupon received from the cabinet general instructions to "concert with the States such measures as should be deemed proper for relieving the emperor and reducing the Elector of Bavaria". Meanwhile, to hoodwink the Dutch, he was affecting to make preparations for the campaign on the Moselle. Not a word was said about a march to the Danube, though, if we are to credit Burnet, Heinsius had unofficial knowledge of the design. Embarking from Harwich about the middle of April, the duke, for the second time that year, arrived at the Hague. The Dutch were wrapped up in their own interests and indifferent to the fate of the emperor. The barrier policy, that is, the occupation of the frontier fortresses, had become the horizon of their vision.

Marlborough's first step on arrival at the Hague was to make formal request to the States-general for permission to detach a part of the combined English and Dutch forces from the Meuse and Schelde to join the army destined for the campaign on the Moselle. There were stormy scenes in the States-general. He had foreseen refusal, and had armed himself with an authorisation from the queen to march with all the troops in English pay. Not till this was known did the Dutch give way. They were left with 70,000 men under Ouwerkerk to guard their frontiers. With the contingent of 15,000, the

CHAP. detachment of which had provoked so much resistance, the  
III. troops starting under the immediate command of Marlborough numbered on paper 40,000.<sup>1</sup> By the middle of May he was ready to march, and hoped to effect by the middle of June a junction with the Margrave of Baden on the Upper Rhine. On May 13 Marshal Tallard, in view of the margrave, crossed the Rhine at Breisach, under cover of the fortress captured by him the previous year. He had with him 13,000 recruits for the Elector of Bavaria and 18,000 regular troops as convoy to a huge train of munitions. Avoiding the German defences by circuitous routes, he delivered the recruits and supplies to the elector and Marshal Marsin at Villingen, and returned with his regulars to rejoin the French army on the Upper Rhine. The Margrave of Baden, whose army now numbered 30,000 men, followed up the elector as he marched back to Ulm. At the beginning of June he was joined by Prince Eugene at Ehingen, on the Upper Danube. At the same time the news was brought that Marlborough with rapid marches was approaching the scene of action.

Marlborough left the Netherlands on May 19, after garrisoning Maestricht with English troops. His army was to be reinforced during his march by troops from Prussia, Lüneburg, and Hesse stationed on the Rhine, and by eleven Dutch battalions at Rothweil, on the borders of the Black Forest. He had advanced no further than Kerpen when Villeroy, to effect a diversion, made a demonstration in force before Huy. Marlborough, foreseeing that Villeroy would probably follow his march, refused the request of Ouwerkerk to halt, and advanced up the Rhine from Bonn, where he heard of Tallard's crossing, to Coblenz. At this point he would have left the Rhine for the expected campaign against the French fortresses on the Moselle; but when, on June 3, he had reached the right bank of the Neckar with the cavalry, his real objective was at last revealed. Meanwhile he had, on May 21 and 23, written dispatches to the States-general justifying his departure from his instructions on the score of the deficiency of the military preparations on the Moselle. He also demanded reinforcements

<sup>1</sup> Alexander Stanhope to Sir Charles Hedges, the Hague, April 25-May 16, 1704, R. O., MS., Holland, 226, f. 327.

against Tallard, who was likely to hasten with the French army of the Upper Rhine to the aid of the Bavarian elector. CHAP.  
III.

On June 9, some days in advance of his cannon and infantry, Marlborough met Prince Eugene at Mundelsheim on the Neckar. The Margrave of Baden joined them at Gross Hep-pach four days later. From this, their first meeting, dated the lifelong friendship of Eugene and Marlborough, both of them alike gifted with the intuition of military genius, and each too highly placed in the confidence of their countrymen for the success of one to eclipse the fame of the other. The Margrave of Baden, who had grown grey in campaigns, had lost the aspiration to initiative. His hungry and ragged troops contrasted ill with the well-clad English, whose appearance had drawn compliments from the Elector of Mainz, and now provoked the admiration of Eugene. Marlborough was already apprised of the margrave's disposition to find excuses for inactivity: he did not, he boasted, make war "*alla Hussara*".<sup>1</sup> He now claimed the command in chief, and it was with the utmost difficulty that he was persuaded to allow Marlborough to command on alternate days. On the 22nd the armies of the margrave and Marlborough effected a junction at Launsheim, about nine English miles north-west of Ulm. They numbered altogether 52,000 men. In Ulm lay 27,000 Bavarians under the elector and 36,000 French under Marshal Marsin; but so many of these were raw recruits that Marlborough was of opinion that, notwithstanding their numerical superiority, he could risk an attack in the open field. To Eugene was assigned the task, with 28,000 troops, of holding the intrenchments of Stollholen in the west of Baden against the French army of the Upper Rhine, numbering 60,000 men.

The plan of Marlborough and the margrave was to entice the Bavarians from their defences by laying waste the north of their country. The united armies marched in a north-north-easterly direction behind the range of hills bordering the north bank of the Danube. Donauwörth, on the north bank, a strongly fortified town, was their objective. If it could be taken it would furnish a base from which to operate.

<sup>1</sup> Eugene to the Emperor, July 31, 1704, F. Heller, *Militarische Korrespondenz des Prinzen Eugen* (Wien, 1848), ii., 186.

CHAP. Max Emanuel, perceiving this and anxious for his electorate,  
III. marched out of Ulm along the north bank of the river and occupied a camp already intrenched between Lauingen and Dillingen. Thence he detached General d'Arco with a force to occupy the Schellenberg, a height on the Danube beyond Donauwörth. On July 1 Marlborough and the margrave, advancing towards Donauwörth, encamped at Amerdingen, about fourteen miles from the foot of the Schellenberg. The roads were drenched with rain and the army incumbered with heavy artillery. Time was pressing, for the enemy were expecting to be reinforced by Tallard. Moreover, the Schellenberg was being fortified with feverish haste, and Marlborough declared that every hour's delay would cost the loss of 1,000 men.

Availing himself of the fact that on the 2nd he was in supreme command, Marlborough ordered an advance at three in the morning of that day. By midday his advanced guard came upon the enemy, still busy completing the defences of the Schellenberg. As the main body could not come up till the afternoon, the margrave counselled postponement of the attack till next day. Marlborough insisted on an immediate assault. At six in the evening he gave the signal. The enemy made a desperate defence, costing the allies 1,500 killed and 4,000 wounded. But before night set in the Bavarian army was destroyed. Out of 10,000 men only 3,000 rejoined the elector. Donauwörth was occupied by the allies. Max Emanuel hurriedly broke up his intrenched camp and threw himself into Augsburg. Marlborough, having crossed the Danube at Donauwörth on July 5, advanced towards Augsburg from the east. The objects of his march, which was circuitous, were to subsist his army in the enemy's country, if possible to capture Munich, and to employ his cavalry in exhausting and destroying the resources of its environs.

Hearing that Tallard was on the march, Eugene left his lines of defence in Baden under the protection of a handful of troops and advanced along the northern bank of the Danube at the head of 9,000 foot and 6,000 horse. About the time (August 3) that Tallard effected a junction with the elector at Augsburg, Eugene reached the plain of Höchstädt on the Danube. The French and Bavarians had now the advantage of position as well as of numbers. They could interrupt the

communications of Eugene with Franconia and Würtemberg, or could overwhelm both Marlborough and the margrave in a hostile country before these could effect a junction with Eugene. Marlborough anticipated this movement, and at once breaking up his camp at Friedberg retraced his steps in a northeasterly direction to Schrobenhausen. To this place, in order to concert operations, Eugene made his way on the 6th across about twenty-eight miles of country, free of the enemy, but intersected with rivers. The two agreed upon the bold step of detaching the margrave with 20,000 men to undertake the siege of Ingolstadt. By this measure, besides the prospect of securing a valuable post, they got rid of a commander who would undoubtedly have opposed their determination to attack the enemy in force. On the 9th they learnt that the French and Bavarian forces were advancing from Augsburg, evidently with the intention of passing the Danube at Lauingen and throwing themselves upon Eugene's troops, whom they outnumbered by nearly four to one. From Augsburg to Höchstädt would be a march of about twenty-seven English miles, with the river Zusam and several smaller watercourses to be crossed before reaching the banks of the Danube. As the whole country was under heavy rains this movement could not be executed with rapidity. The combined French and Bavarians crossed to the north bank of the Danube on the 10th. Eugene on the same day, having rejoined his troops in the morning, retired eight miles towards Donauwörth, taking up a position behind the small river Kessel, about eleven miles separating him from the enemy. He now had, some three to four miles in his rear, Donauwörth and the Schellenberg, which had been freshly fortified by the allies. About ten miles intervened between him and Marlborough, crossed, however, by the Lech, the Danube, and, on the northern side of the Danube, the Wernitz. Everything depended upon whether he could hold his ground till Marlborough reached him with his main body.

The reconnaissances of the French were so ineffective that they did not know of Marlborough's line of march, and though they had heard of the diversion of the margrave and his forces to Ingolstadt, they refused to credit the intelligence.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "M. Tallard declared that if they durst confide in their intelligence that Prince Lewis was left to besiege Ingoldstadt, they would have fallen upon us in

CHAP  
III.

On the 11th, therefore, they did nothing more than move some seven miles down the northern bank of the Danube, as far as the neighbourhood of Blindheim or Blenheim, a village about three miles below Höchstädt, and within sight of the encampment of Eugene, whose army during the day was marshalled in expectation of an attack. Meanwhile, on the night of the 10th, Marlborough at Rain, ten miles distant as the crow flies, received a dispatch from Eugene urging him to hasten his march. He at once ordered forward twenty battalions under his brother General Charles Churchill, who started at one in the morning, and by three o'clock the main army was in motion.<sup>1</sup> By ten o'clock the next night the junction of Eugene and Marlborough was complete.

Even as late as the morning of the 12th the French still had an advantageous opportunity to attack. It had been necessary to leave the artillery to follow, and after a march of four and twenty miles it and the baggage had only arrived at daybreak. Marlborough's men were worn with fatigue, and he had had no time in which to plan his dispositions. The forces of the Grand Alliance numbered between 52,000 and 54,000 men; those of the combined French and Bavarians some 2,000 to 4,000 more. The Danube here flows in a north-easterly direction. Its valley, in which the battle known to us by the name of Blenheim was fought, stretches seven English miles in length, from the Kessel on the north-east to Dillingen on the south-west, and is of irregular breadth. North-westwards the valley is skirted by broken and wooded hills at Dapfheim only half a mile from the river. Midway between the Kessel and Dillingen the little river Nebel runs across the valley and pours itself into the Danube, east of the village of Blenheim which lies on the river bank. Here the valley is at its broadest, being nearly three miles. In the middle of the valley, lying north-eastwards of the Nebel, was the village of Unterglauheim. About 1,200 yards to the north-west, on the

our camp the day before." Metcalfe Graham to James Graham, giving a short account of Blenheim, August 23, 1704, *Bagot MSS.*, p. 338, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 1885.

<sup>1</sup> Dispatch of Marlborough to Harley, giving an account of Blenheim August 14, 1704, *Thirtieth Report of the Deputy-Keeper of the Public Records*, cviii., 311.

French side of the Nebel, was the village of Oberglauheim, and a mile and a quarter west of Oberglauheim was the village of Lutzingen, on the spur of the hills. The soil between Blenheim and Oberglauheim was marshy and the ground was seamed by numerous watercourses.

CIIAP.  
III.

At two o'clock in the morning of the 13th news was brought into the French camp that the army of the Grand Alliance was stirring. The right wing under Eugene was ordered to advance westwards into the hill country. It consisted of about 18,000 men, of whom nearly half were cavalry. The left wing under Marlborough numbered 34,000 to 36,000 men, the proportion of foot to horse being about three to one. It stretched down to the Danube and consisted of English, Dutch, Danes, Hessians, and Brunswickers. The duke's brother, General Churchill, was at the head of the infantry; the Princes of Würtemberg, Baireuth, and Hesse-Cassel held subordinate commands. Close to the Danube, to attack Blenheim, marched the corps of Lord Cutts. The distance between the two opposed camps was above five English miles. The French and Bavarian camp stretched across the valley at its broadest part, its right resting on Blenheim, its extreme left being in front of Lutzingen and on the spur of the hill beyond. As soon as it was realised that Marlborough and Eugene were marching to attack, a hurried consultation took place between the elector and the two French marshals, Marsin and Tallard. Their armies occupied a position offering distinct advantages for defence.<sup>1</sup> From the spurs of the hills on their left artillery fire could be directed against the advancing enemy; the three villages of Unterglauheim and Oberglauheim in the middle of the valley, and of Blenheim on their right, could be strongly held, while in the neighbourhood of Blenheim were slight eminences affording positions for artillery.

Between seven and eight o'clock in the morning, the two armies were deploying with bands playing as if on a parade ground. Spectators have described the brilliancy of

<sup>1</sup> The Earl of Orkney, who held the rank of major-general, wrote after the battle: "I confess it is intirely owing to my Lord Duke, for I declare, had I been to give my opinion, I had been against it, considering the ground wher they were incamped and the strenth of the army". *Engl. Hist. Rev.* (April, 1924), xix., 311.

CHAP. the scene lit up by the morning sun. Eugene's advance  
III. through hilly country, overgrown with brushwood, was difficult and slow. Not till after midday did Marlborough receive a dispatch announcing his readiness to take part in a general attack. The duke had drawn up his troops in four lines. Contrary to the usual practice of the day, he had placed his infantry in the first and fourth, his cavalry in the second and third lines instead of on the flank. A slight space separated his left from the ten battalions of infantry, close to the Danube's bank, which had been detailed under Cutts for the assault on Blenheim. The village was defended by barricades and crowded with French infantry. Three assaults were repulsed with great loss. In the centre of the field of battle Marlborough's cavalry were twice routed by the French horse, while the German infantry attacking Oberglaubeim were charged by the Irish brigade in the French service, and other regiments, and were cut to pieces. This was a critical moment, for the advance of the French would sever Marlborough from Eugene. Marlborough himself galloped to the spot and, charging at the head of some squadrons of the imperial cavalry which were at hand, drove the French back. Eugene's immediate command fared no better than the German infantry. His cavalry were three times dispersed by the French, and at four o'clock the attack all along the line had proved a failure.

It was at this crisis that the genius of Marlborough asserted itself by a complete change of plan, conceived in the confusion of a losing battle. He withdrew troops from the wings and concentrated on the centre, supported by the reserves. In a quarter of an hour his army was in a new formation, his cavalry in two lines in front, behind them two lines of infantry under General Churchill. His cavalry and the united cavalry of Tallard and Marsin were now face to face. Twice was the English charge repulsed, but the infantry, advancing in support, enabled the cavalry to reform. The fire of the foot threw the French horse into a slight confusion. At this moment the whole English cavalry in a long line extending from Blenheim to Oberglaubeim charged for the third time. It broke the French squadrons and their rout revealed Tallard's blunder in denuding



his centre of infantry in order to overcrowd Blenheim.<sup>1</sup> The French infantry in the centre were surrounded by the superior numbers of the English foot; a wedge was driven between the army of Tallard and that of Marsin on his left, and Tallard found himself a prisoner. The French horse dispersed, some making for the Danube, others for the hills. The Bavarians on the left wing of the French retreated in good order. Only the garrison of Blenheim, 9,000 strong, remained. They had missed the moment at which a sally might have given the cavalry time to rally and now vainly endeavoured to break through Churchill's infantry in the direction of Höchstädt. After sustaining a fierce assault by Lord Orkney at the head of eight battalions, they laid down their arms.

CHAP.  
III.

On the field of victory Marlborough, tearing a leaf from a commissary's memorandum book, scribbled with a lead pencil on the back of a bill half a dozen lines to the duchess, bidding her let the queen "know her army has had a glorious victory". The day had cost the allies 12,000 men killed and wounded, but the French and Bavarians in killed, wounded and prisoners had lost 28,000 men, besides almost all their artillery. Among the prisoners were a marshal of France and sixteen general officers.<sup>2</sup> The battle of Blenheim marked the first great defeat of a French army in the field during the reign of Louis XIV., and the first great success which had fallen to the arms of the Grand Alliance. It saved Vienna, it delivered up Bavaria to the conqueror, it enabled the emperor to rally his forces to the defeat of the Hungarian insurgents, the allies of the French, it fortified the resolution of the German princes, it reinvigorated the war party in the Netherlands, and it confirmed the belief of Heinsius in the genius of Marlborough and discredited the former interventions of the field-deputies. In Spain it determined the defection of some influential grandees from Philip V. to the archduke. In Savoy it reanimated the resistance of the duke. But beyond all these effects, it stirred

<sup>1</sup> See Capt. R. Pope's criticism in *Coke MSS.*, p. 40, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 12th Rep., App., pt. iii.

<sup>2</sup> See letter of Capt. R. Pope, August 16, 1704, in *Coke MSS.*, p. 40, and the list given by Marlborough's chaplain, Dr. Hare, in *Hare MSS.*, p. 201, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 14th Rep., App., pt. ix., 1895.

CHAP. the English nation to enthusiasm for the war, and depressed  
III. the high Tories correspondingly.

Under the cover of darkness the broken regiments of the French and Bavarians made for Lauingen, about nine miles in their rear, and crossed the Danube. The exertions of the Elector of Bavaria restored some semblance of order to the fugitives. Marlborough and Eugene did not follow up the retreating enemy. They were incumbered with wounded and prisoners, and Marlborough, who had been seventeen hours in the saddle on the day of Blenheim, and had had only three hours' sleep the night after the battle, was incapacitated for further exertion. On the 14th, therefore, he and Eugene marched up the bank of the Danube to Steinheim, little more than four miles. Here they remained four days, resting their troops and dividing the prisoners, who numbered 11,192 men.<sup>1</sup> It was with difficulty that they succeeded in persuading the margrave to relinquish the siege of Ingolstadt, where he had already made some progress, and from which he hoped for compensation for having failed to share Marlborough's glory. On the 23rd they marched to Sefeligen, within an English mile of Ulm. Here they were joined by the margrave and his army, which, after a halt of five days, they left to undertake the reduction of that city. With the remainder of their forces they marched towards the Rhine. Through the defiles of the Black Forest the French retreat was little better than a flight. Starved for provisions, since their stores had fallen into Marlborough's hands, short of waggons, weakened by desertions, dispersed by attacks of the peasantry, their numbers were reduced when they were met by Marshal Villeroy, who had followed Marlborough's tracks, at the entrances of the passes to the Black Forest, to scarcely 20,000 men.

In the state of discouragement into which so large a part of the French forces was thrown, an invasion of Alsace appeared to Marlborough and Eugene to promise success. But they reckoned without the margrave and the German generals, who preferred the familiar and less hazardous course of an

<sup>1</sup> Many French soldiers separated from the main body surrendered during some days after the action to escape being murdered by the peasantry. James Brydges to Thomas Coke, August 19, 1704, *Coke MSS.*, p. 42.

investment. Marlborough accordingly agreed to a siege of Landau by the margrave as a step to securing the principal fortresses on the Moselle, where he contemplated a campaign in the following year. While covering the siege in concert with Eugene, he strengthened the position of the allies by carrying through negotiations entered into by the Electress of Bavaria. By the convention of Ilbesheim on November 7, the Bavarian garrisons were surrendered to the emperor, the electress being guaranteed in exchange\* sufficient revenues and a residence in Munich. As a base for the campaign on the Moselle, Marlborough surprised and captured Treves on October 29. On November 24, when the siege of Landau was approaching a successful conclusion, he visited Berlin, where Frederick I. was wavering between territorial aggrandisement at the expense of Poland and the prospect of subsidies for maintaining the extravagance of his court. Fresh with the glory of Blenheim upon him, he succeeded in persuading the king to sign a treaty promising 8,000 more men for next year's campaign in Italy. On December 11 Marlborough embarked for England, accompanied by Marshal Tallard and other distinguished prisoners, and with the standards and colours, the trophies of his victory.

CHAP.  
III.

Marlborough, before leaving for Holland in April, 1704, had concerted with Rooke an attack upon Toulon in co-operation with a land force under the Duke of Savoy. On May 8 Rooke left Lisbon for Nice with thirty English and nineteen Dutch sail of the line, besides frigates and smaller vessels. The troops at his disposal consisted of 1,900 English and 400 Dutch marines. Prince George of Hesse-Darmstadt accompanied him with 5,000 men under his command. In the meanwhile the English government learnt that the Duke of Savoy, unable to maintain himself in the field against the overwhelming numbers of the French, was unequal to assisting in any attempt upon Toulon. It therefore ordered Rooke to watch for and intercept the fleet of the young Count of Toulouse, the son of Louis XIV. and Madame de Montespan, in the event of its evading Sir Cloudisley Shovell, who was cruising in the Channel to prevent its escape from Brest. Rooke put about, and on the 7th caught sight of the French fleet. Failing to overtake it, he, on June 27, N.S., effected

CHAP. a junction with Shovell and twenty-three sail of the line at  
III. Lagos.

At the head of a fleet of seventy-two ships, carrying with troops 30,000 men, Rooke was now in a position to make a fresh attempt upon Cadiz. But four successive dispatches from Methuen, our ambassador in Portugal, urging him to this or, in the alternative, to the capture of Port Mahon, were disregarded by him on the plea that the army was not adequate to the task. Prince George then, it is said at the suggestion of Vice-Admiral Sir John Leake, wrote a formal proposal to Rooke to substitute for an attack on Cadiz an attempt on Gibraltar. It was time something was done. The court of King Pedro and that of the archduke were both irritated at Rooke's supineness and a second Vigo was scarcely likely to follow a second Cadiz. On August 1, N.S., Rear-Admiral George Byng with seventeen ships and three bomb vessels, sailing from Tetuan, anchored in the bay of Gibraltar. Rooke followed with the remainder of the fleet on the next day, and landed Prince George with the marines and a body of Spanish troops for the assault of the landport gate. The prince, after repulsing a sally of a few horsemen, sent the governor a summons to surrender. The whole garrison numbered no more than 470 men, and of these only eighty were regulars. French engineers had recently designed some new fortifications, but not one of them had been carried out. A bombardment of about six hours sufficed to compel the garrison to offer terms. By a capitulation of August 6, drawn up by Prince George, they were allowed to march out with arms and baggage, but the inhabitants who should stay were to take the oath of allegiance to Charles III.<sup>1</sup> The loss of the allies, chiefly the result of the blowing up of a fort, was sixty-one killed and 252 men wounded. This was the first conquest for Charles III. in Spain.

Rooke, leaving Gibraltar in order to winter at Ceuta, dispatched a considerable number of vessels for various services,

<sup>1</sup> This was in accordance with the instructions of Nottingham to Ormonde on the occasion of the expedition against Cadiz (June 19, 1702): "Her majesty is resolv'd that upon taking or the surrender of that (Cadiz) or any other place, the burghers shall take an oath of fidelity to the Archduke, tho' the garrison to be left by your grace shall be entirely under her majesty's orders and commands". *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 7th Rep., App., p. 763.

and on the 11th worked eastwards in search of the French fleet, which had emerged from Toulon. Its nominal commander was the Count of Toulouse, its real commander was D'Estrées, an admiral then in his eightieth year. The French fleet consisted of fifty sail of the line, six frigates, and twenty-eight large galleys, besides fireships and tenders, carrying 3,577 guns and 24,275 men. The allies had fifty-one sail of the line and six frigates, two bomb vessels and some tenders and fireships, but only seven of their ships, as contrasted with seventeen of the French, were three-deckers. On August 24, the allied fleet, having passed the French fleet on the night of the 22nd, was sailing westwards off Malaga, before a light easterly wind, when it came in sight of the enemy. The French on seeing them hove-to in a crescent-shaped line of battle. The allies advanced slowly in échelon, Vice-Admiral Sir John Leake leading the van, under Sir Cloudisley Shovell's command. The centre of twenty six sail was under Rooke, the rear was made up of twelve Dutch ships under Callenburg. The battle lasted from ten o'clock in the morning till seven at night. Before it was over the ammunition of the English, which had been depleted by the bombardment of Gibraltar and the provision of a magazine there, began to run short and nine ships had to be towed out of action.<sup>1</sup> The battle was indecisive, except that the Dutch drove the French rear out of action; but there was not a vessel captured, sunk, or burnt on either side. During the night Rooke carefully redistributed his remaining ammunition. The French, however, who had suffered equally, did not renew the fight on the following day, and the two fleets remained within sight of each other. At night, doubling northwards in the darkness, the French fleet made for Toulon. The French had lost heavily, 3,048 of their number being killed and wounded as compared with 2,718 of the allies. Rooke left sixteen sail of the line under Leake to winter at Lisbon and himself returned to England (September 10-21).

The capture of Gibraltar made little impression upon the English people. It is true that the greater part of the garrison

<sup>1</sup> "Five of our biggest in the middle," that is, in Rooke's division. James Brydges to Thomas Coke, September 14, 1704, *Cowper MSS.*, iii., 45.

CHAP.  
III.

were English,<sup>1</sup> but Rooke, before leaving, had written to Pedro II. and the archduke, requesting them to supply the whole garrison. Harley, either having a wider outlook or anxious to say the best for a ministry of which he was a member, wrote to the Duke of Newcastle as a parenthesis in a gossipy letter: "The taking of Gibraltar may turn to great account, it being the greatest thoroughfare in the world".<sup>2</sup> The ministry consulted Marlborough. He replied to Hedges that "no cost ought to be spared to maintain it," and a dispatch of October 10 from the lord high admiral to Leake at Lisbon acquainted him with the resolution of the government to undertake it. Such were the slow and reluctant steps by which this great possession was finally acquired. The efforts of the Spaniards and French for its recapture were the most potent factors in the education of the public opinion of the country as to its value. With regard to Rooke's battle off Malaga the public exhibited a much more lively concern. Whether the ineptitude of his previous conduct as a naval commander had been due to ill-health or to a fear of responsibility, he had lost credit. But a battle had been fought, and a victory at sea was essential to the glory of the tory party and of their naval hero. The shrewd Godolphin, indeed, was not deceived. "Upon the whole," he sums up, "it seems to have been a sort of drawn battle where both sides had enough of it."<sup>3</sup> The Count of Toulouse returned to Toulon, boasting that he had driven the allies out of the Mediterranean, and Louis, with paternal pride, had a medal struck to commemorate the victory. On the other hand, it was to be said that Toulouse had weighed anchor to retake Gibraltar and that Rooke had balked his design. It may be added now that the French never again during the war pretended to sweep the Mediterranean with a grand fleet. Naval supremacy remained, though not altogether uncontested, with the allies.

Louis was little disposed to brook the desertion of Portugal to the Grand Alliance. In February, 1704, he dispatched James Duke of Berwick, the son of James II. by Marlborough's sister,

<sup>1</sup> "For its security he (Rooke) hath left 2,000 marines in garrison." James Brydges, M.P., to Thomas Coke, September 14, 1704, *Cowper MSS.*, iii., 45.

<sup>2</sup> *Portland MSS.*, ii., 186, September 5, 1704.

<sup>3</sup> Godolphin to Harley, September 14, 1704, *Bath MSS.*, i., 62.

Arabella Churchill, to take command of the French and Spanish troops in the peninsula. Berwick had already acquired a high reputation as a commander in the French service. He determined to anticipate the allies, and on May 4 at the head of 28,000 men, crossed the frontier of Portugal. To meet him the allies mustered at Lisbon some 5,500 English<sup>1</sup> under Meinhart, Duke of Schomberg and Leinster, 3,500 Dutch under General Fagel, and 20,000 Portuguese. As the invaders advanced in two divisions, the northern column in the direction of the Douro, the southern towards Lisbon, two armies were organised to meet them. The northern army was under the Marquis das Minas, an expert veteran of seventy years. The English and Dutch were assigned to the southern force.

Early in May the combined English, Dutch, and Portuguese troops took post in the neighbourhood of Elvas with the object of disputing Berwick's advance on Lisbon. Unfortunately Schomberg lacked both the military genius and the conciliatory temper of Marlborough. His disputes with the Dutch general Fagel ran so high that Fagel marched out of the camp at the head of his men with the intention of joining Das Minas. As Berwick advanced, one fortified place fell after another with little or no resistance. But in the north the fortune of war was otherwise. Das Minas drove the Spanish general Ronquillo back across the frontier, baffled the endeavours of Berwick, who hastened to his lieutenant's assistance, to force an action, and finally, aided by the southern army, compelled the entire invading force to retreat. The result of the campaign was that while Berwick could boast the capture of several garrisons, including two English regiments, Stanhope's and Stewart's, surrendered by their Portuguese general, Das Minas was acclaimed as the saviour of Portugal. Schomberg, quarrelsome, sluggish, and incapable, was recalled to England at the request of the court of Lisbon. In his place Marlborough selected a French refugee officer, Henri de Massue de Ruvigny, Earl of Galway. Galway had been raised to the Irish peerage for his distinguished military services, and seems in some respects to have resembled Marlborough himself. He is, wrote Godolphin, "one of the finest

<sup>1</sup> On paper 6,500, but see the Duke of Ormonde to General Earle, May 16, 1704, *Ormonde MSS.*, p. 771, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 7th Rep., App.

CHAP. gentlemen of the army, with a head fitted for the cabinet as  
III. well as the camp". He arrived in Lisbon on August 10, with a view to an autumn campaign. But the Portuguese organisation was too defective for an invasion of Spain, and Berwick's intrenchments on the river Agueda too formidable to be taken by storm. At the beginning of October the Anglo-Portuguese army retired into winter quarters.

Since the return of Rooke to England, Prince George of Hesse-Darmstadt had been left in command at Gibraltar. His garrison numbered 2,442 men of whom nearly 2,000 were English marines and 400 Dutch. At the instance of Louis XIV., whose abortive design for its fortification shewed that he appreciated its value, the Spanish government resolved upon its recapture. With this purpose General Villadarias, at the head of 8,000 Spanish troops, sat down in front of it early in September. He was supported by 4,000 French marines, landed from Toulon on October 4 by the French Rear-Admiral de Pointis, who with his fleet of fourteen sail of the line and seventeen frigates made for the harbour of Cadiz, whence he could issue to intercept relief from Lisbon. The superior artillery of the besiegers made breaches in the fortifications and gradually silenced the guns of the garrison. A plan to deliver a grand assault with 3,000 men on the night of November 10 was frustrated by the appearance on the 9th of Sir John Leake at the head of a squadron bringing munitions and supplies. Leake sailed home on December 13 to hasten reinforcements. By that time the garrison was weakened by sickness, on December 2 only 1,000 men being fit for duty. At the end of the month, 2,500 English and Dutch troops were landed. On the other side, 4,000 men, chiefly French, joined the besiegers as a reinforcement from Marshal de Tessé, who had superseded Berwick as commander-in-chief of the French forces in Spain. On March 21, 1705, Leake, at the head of a fleet of thirty-five ships, eight of them Portuguese and one Dutch, entered the bay with reinforcements, surprising part of a squadron of De Pointis, of which he captured three and destroyed two ships. Tessé, who had arrived in February, now despaired of success. On April 23 he set out for Madrid, and the siege of Gibraltar was at an end. The moral and material importance of the defeat of the Bourbons



was very great. The result produced sensible effects both in England and Spain. It greatly strengthened the Austrian party in Catalonia and Aragon. In England it aroused popular interest in the maintenance of the fortress. Towards this end there seemed to be two principal means; the acquisition of a Mediterranean harbour in which an English fleet might winter and the destruction of the arsenal of Toulon.

The political capital sought to be made by the two parties out of affairs abroad was exemplified by the addresses of the two houses upon the opening of parliament. The lords contented themselves with a reference to Blenheim, the commons added to Blenheim a clause congratulating the queen on "the victory obtained by your majesty's fleet under the command and by the courage of Sir George Rooke". "My Lord Marlborough's friends," commented Stepney, "thought that and Blenheim ought not to be mentioned on a day."<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, the coupling of Blenheim and Malaga became the *mot d'ordre* of the High Church party, and even of the Jacobites.<sup>2</sup> This transparent trick, while it outraged common sense, was repugnant to the queen's sense of gratitude. The resentment she felt was shewn by the promotion of Sir Clowdisley Shovell in Rooke's place as admiral and commander-in-chief of the fleet. Rooke, though on this occasion his conduct had been unexceptionable, was never employed again. Marlborough, on the other hand, was granted the royal manor of Woodstock with the consent of parliament, and received a promise from the queen of the palace now known by the name of Blenheim.

The queen's speech at the opening of parliament, October 29, 1704, expressed, at some length and with unmistakeable significance, her trust that there would be "no contentions" between the houses. But the tory majority in the commons were committed to an irreconcilable position by the fatal inheritance of the occasional conformity bill. To shirk their pledges would have cost its author, Bromley, his seat for the University of Oxford, and the tory party generally the support

<sup>1</sup> Stepney to Shrewsbury, Vienna, November 11-22, 1704, *Buckley MSS.*, ii., 2, 703.

<sup>2</sup> "His (Rooke's) health is now drunk by those who won't drink the queen's health, nor yours." De Foe to Harley, September 28, 1704, *Portland MSS.*, iv., 136.

CHAP. of the clergy at the coming general election. It was at first  
 III. resolved, at a private meeting of the party,<sup>1</sup> not to vote the supplies until the lords had passed the bill. But at, it is said, the insidious suggestion of Harley,<sup>2</sup> who was still speaker, the more offensive course threatened by Seymour was decided upon. The occasional conformity bill was to be sent to the lords tacked to a money bill. This proposal, as was doubtless foreseen, at once enlisted in the opposition the conservative instincts of the more moderate churchmen, roused in the lords uncommitted to the whig party the instinct of self-preservation, and ranged the influence of the services against the whole measure. Lord Cutts, one of the heroes of Blenheim, warned the party, of which he was himself a member, that the stoppage of the supplies consequent on the tack would break up the Grand Alliance. There was a defection from the middle party to the whig view. The high churchmen were beaten on the question of a tack by 251 to 134 votes. The bill was read a third time on December 14, but its sting had been drawn. It was thrown out by the lords the next day, after a perfunctory debate upon the second reading, by 71 to 50 votes.

By the end of the year two rebuffs had been suffered by the High Church party. They had failed in the tack, and the common sense of parliament and the country had gone against their reckless counsels in a crisis, to be narrated hereafter, which had arisen in England's relations to Scotland. But they were still resolute to get rid of Godolphin, who alone stood in the way of an administration which Rochester and Nottingham would inspire. On Godolphin's side there was no blinking the fact that he and they had broken for ever. "I shall never," he wrote to the Duchess of Marlborough, "think any man fit to continue in his employment who gave his vote for the tack." Godolphin only expressed the feeling of the time that "the Queen's servants" were generally expected to vote against measures discountenanced by the court, very much as members of a ministry are now expected to support their chief. And that the attitude of the court towards political parties had changed

<sup>1</sup> Godolphin to Harley, November 8-19, 1704, *Bath MSS.*, i., 35.

<sup>2</sup> "I hope everybody will do you the justice to attribute the greatest share of it (the defeat of the bill) to your prudent management and zeal for the public." Marlborough to Harley, December 16, 1704, *ibid.*, p. 65.

was shewn by a significant warning in the queen's speech at the close of the session, March 14, 1705, against "any dangerous experiments for the future".

The end of the year 1704 was rendered stormy by the revival under a new form of the Aylesbury election controversy. During the recess, Ashby had obtained execution upon his judgement as delivered in the house of lords. Thereupon five other burgesses of the town of Aylesbury, whose votes had also been rejected by the constables, brought actions for damages. No step was taken by the house of commons against Ashby, but the five who followed his example were committed by the house to Newgate on December 5, for breach of privilege. A majority of the judges of the queen's bench holding that a writ of *habeas corpus* could not issue against the house of commons, the prisoners petitioned for a writ of error. Their case was then taken up by the house of lords, who passed a resolution that a writ of error was a writ of right, and could not be denied by the crown (March 14, 1705). To an address of the lords in this sense, the queen answered that "there was an absolute necessity of putting an immediate end to this session". The prisoners were thereby released, the house of commons having no jurisdiction to continue an imprisonment beyond its own session. Only the constitutional lawyer is left to regret that by this evasion the important issues raised remain to this day undetermined.

In accordance with the provisions of the triennial act, a proclamation for dissolving Queen Anne's first parliament was issued on April 5, 1705. The increased influence of the whigs had become apparent. The queen had for a year resisted the desire of Godolphin and Marlborough to dismiss the Duke of Buckingham, but on April 1 the privy seal was transferred to the Duke of Newcastle,<sup>1</sup> whose house was the social centre of the whig party. It was remarked as significant that on April 8 the queen dined with Lord Orford, who, with Somers, Wharton, Halifax, and Sunderland composed the whig direction which went by the name of "the Junta". The exasperation of the high churchmen at these symptoms of the abandonment of their party by its chief support knew no bounds.

<sup>1</sup> Godolphin to Harley, *Bath MSS.*, i., 67.

CHAP. III. There was a war of pamphlets. Of these, that which played the greatest part in the tory interest was a joint production by a physician named Drake and some others with the title *The Memorial of the Church of England*. This reflected directly on the queen, as giving "comfortable speeches and kind assurances" to those who would destroy the Church. It created great indignation, and on a presentment by the grand jury of Middlesex as "a false, scandalous, and traitorous libel," was ordered to be publicly burnt. The whigs revenged themselves by publishing lists of the tackers, and in *The Character of a Tacker and Anti-Tacker*, holding them up to public contempt. No sooner was it evident that the elections were a triumph for the whigs than Godolphin shewed his perception that the time had come to repay their services. Both he and Marlborough had long writhed under the annoyance of the cabals of Sir Nathan Wright, the incompetent lord keeper. Wright owed his place to his zeal as a churchman, and now that his party had broken with the queen, "it would have been too ridiculous to have continued it longer in his hands".<sup>1</sup> The new lord keeper, William Cowper, appointed on October 11, was a whig who adopted a somewhat independent attitude to the junta, but was of conciliatory address and personally acceptable to all parties.<sup>2</sup> A few High Church privy councillors were dismissed. Addison was made an under-secretary of state. The satisfaction of the whigs by the admission of their leaders to office was still postponed, but a friendly understanding, it was generally believed, had been established between Godolphin and the junta.

The new parliament met on October 25, 1705. The first trial of strength in the house of commons was a contest for the speakership. The candidate of the ministry was John Smith, a former commissioner of the treasury and, at the end of William III.'s reign, chancellor of the exchequer. On the other side was Bromley, the leader of the tackers. Smith was elected by a majority of forty-three votes, and his victory was interpreted as a sign that the court party was now de-

<sup>1</sup> Godolphin to Harley, October 1, 1705, *Bath MSS.*, i. 64 (wrongly dated by editor 1704; see *ibid.*, p. 78).

<sup>2</sup> "I am very glad you are so well pleased with Lord Keeper." Marlborough to Harley, June 27-July 8, 1706, *Bath MSS.*, i., 82.

finitely allied with the whigs.<sup>1</sup> The queen's speech contained two notable passages. The first was an exhortation to parliament to continue the war until France was dispossessed of Spain, the balance of power restored, and the trade of the country preserved from extinction by French monopoly. It was a word in season, for in August the French had opened confidential communications with the Grand Pensionary Heinsius. The pensionary wavered and Marlborough became uneasy. If not sated with glory, he was at least wearied with disappointment, and his letters spoke longingly of retirement. But he was firmly convinced that England could "never consent that the Indies and Spain should remain in the hands of the Duke of Anjou". Godolphin and Harley shared his views. The queen's speech was directed to determine the hesitation of the Dutch.<sup>2</sup> The other point of the speech was one personal to the queen. The suggestion that she was betraying the interests of the Church, to her zeal for which she had so publicly testified, stung her to the quick. She referred with "warmth" to the malice of the pamphleteers and, after protesting her devotion to the Church, she added a paragraph which shewed how far she had travelled from the High Church party in the course of the past three years—"I will inviolably maintain the toleration".

CHAP.  
III.

On November 15 Lord Haversham in the house of lords hurled the tory defiance. The queen herself was present, but such was the recklessness or the exasperation of the tories, that Haversham made no scruple to assail her conduct in taking notice of the disputes between the two houses. After attacking the ministry for the failure of the campaign on the Moselle, he concluded with a motion for an address to the queen to invite the Electress Sophia to reside in England. He was supported by the tory leaders, by Rochester, Nottingham, Anglesey, and Buckingham; their argument being that the proximity of the pretender would enable him to seize the throne in the event of the queen's unexpected death. The whig leaders watched the course of the debate. They saw the

<sup>1</sup> *Portland MSS.*, iv., 250.

<sup>2</sup> The Duke of Shrewsbury, then at Frankfort, notes in his diary under November 1, 1705: "The Duke of Marlborough came and drank tea with me. . . . His discourse was to show how averse the Queen of England was to a peace." *Buckleuch MSS.*, ii., 2, 794.

CHAP. III. ministry hostile to the proposal and the annoyance of the queen. They seized the opportunity of ingratiating themselves with the court, and defeated the motion. The queen, on her side, made no secret of her change of feeling. "I believe," she wrote to the Duchess of Marlborough, "dear Mrs. Freeman (the duchess) and I shall not disagree as we have formerly done; for I am sensible of the services those people (the whigs) have done me that you have a good opinion of, and will countenance them, and am thoroughly convinced of the malice and insolence of them (the Tories) that you have always been speaking against." At the court of Hanover feeling ran in the opposite direction. The Electress Sophia never condoned the whig desertion.

The Tory argument that the pretender might find the government unprepared had not been lost on the whigs. It was suggested by Burnet that the most effective mode of proving the attachment of their party to the Protestant succession, and at the same time of redeeming their credit with the court of Hanover, was to take timely precautions against the indicated dangers by the constitution of a regency to come into legal existence at the queen's death. The regency bill, introduced by Lord Wharton, nominated seven of the most eminent officers of state, the archbishop of Canterbury, the lord keeper, the lord treasurer, the lord president of the council, the lord privy seal, and the lord chief justice of England, with power reserved to the successor to add to their number. The regents were, upon the queen's death, to proclaim the next sovereign; and the last parliament, even though dissolved, was to be summoned again and to continue sitting for six months.<sup>1</sup> A bill was passed at the same time for naturalising the electress and her issue.<sup>2</sup> As a consequence of the regency act, the statute of 1700 as to the tenure of places under the crown by members of the house of commons needed revision. An act followed<sup>3</sup> by which members accepting a place of profit under the crown *ipso facto* vacate their seats, but are eligible for re-election. This act survives to our own day, an obsolescent evidence of the jealousy felt by our ancestors of the influence of the sovereign.

<sup>1</sup> 4 Anne, c. 8.<sup>2</sup> 4 Anne, c. 1.<sup>3</sup> 5 Anne, c. 8.

The junta now made use of the obtuse fanaticism of Rochester to strengthen the unfavourable disposition of the queen towards the High Church party. Halifax laid a trap into which Rochester readily walked. He moved an inquiry into the dangers alleged to be threatening the Church. In the queen's presence Rochester paraded once again the propositions which excited her indignation, the necessity of sending for the Hanoverian heir, and of passing the occasional conformity bill. The question whether the Church of England was in danger was negatived by sixty-one to thirty votes, and a resolution was passed by the lords that "whoever goes about to suggest and insinuate that the Church is in danger under her majesty's administration is an enemy to the queen, the Church, and the kingdom". Against this resolution the High Church leaders entered a formal protest. A debate on the same subject in the house of commons resulted, on December 7, in a concurrence with the lords by 222 to 161 votes. Both houses then agreed on an address to the queen, asking her to take measures for the punishment of the authors and spreaders of these "scandalous and seditious reports". A proclamation to this effect was issued, and the apprehension of the printer of "*The Memorial*" ordered. Parliament was prorogued on March 19, 1706. For the first time for some years, the session had ended with harmony between the two houses. The triumph of the whigs appeared complete.

Ireland reproduced, though with strong local colouring, the political and religious struggles that divided England. It was reckoned against Rochester that during his shadowy viceroyalty he had done nothing more than add to the divisions already distracting the country. Before his time, it was said, papist and protestant was the only marked line of cleavage: after him divisions were set up among protestants. Churchman and dissenter forgot "the common enemy" to fly each at the other's throat. It is impossible to lay down with any degree of assurance the numbers of the different denominations. Despite the fact that the toleration act of William III. did not obtain in Ireland, the nonconformists boasted in the reign of Anne that they at least equalled the protestant episcopalians, while in Ulster they outnumbered them. They were recruited by a steady stream of Scottish

CHAP. III. presbyterians, members of a Church dominant in their own country and the suppression of which in Ireland no statesman would venture to undertake. They received a quasi-recognition by the contribution called the *Regium Donum* to the support of their ministers, amounting to £1,200. Originally granted by Charles II., but dropped by his successor, it was maintained by Godolphin, despite the protests of the convocation of Ireland and of both houses of the Irish parliament. The governing classes, both lay and clerical, were united against presbyterianism. The "sin of schism," which the bishops saw in it, had a side which obtruded itself upon the lay landowner. "The true point," wrote Archbishop King, "between them and the gentlemen is whether the presbyterians and lay elders in every parish shall have the greatest influence over the people, to lead them as they please, or the landlords over their tenants."

It was hoped that with the resignation of Rochester in February, 1703, the dissension which he had infused into Irish protestantism would have spent its force. Unhappily, the Duke of Ormonde, who succeeded him, was controlled from England by Rochester's ally Nottingham.<sup>1</sup> Some mystery, however, still hangs about the origin of the blow dealt at the Irish nonconformists by the hands of the English ministry of 1704. A bill was passed by the Irish house of commons in November, 1703, "to prevent the growth of popery,"<sup>2</sup> framed upon the lines of the similar act of 1700.<sup>3</sup> To the severities of this statute the Irish act added that the old English law of gavelkind should be applied to estates, unless the persons on whom they were

<sup>1</sup> The duke has been represented by Tindal (*History of England*, iii., 523, ed. 1763) as animated by the mischievous bigotry of Rochester, but two of Ormonde's letters discredit this view of his disposition. On December 26, 1703, he expresses his disapproval of the occasional conformity bill (*Ormonde MSS.*, p. 768). In another letter he says: "I have gott the Queen to lett me have a summe not exceeding 1,200 per annum, to be disposed of amongst those Presbyterian ministers that will behave themselves so as to deserve her Majesty's favour and bounty" (Ormonde to Lord Mount Alexander, January 9, 1704-5, *ibid.*, p. 771). If this refers to the *Regium Donum*, it must be remembered that its withdrawal had been demanded by the Irish convocation, and was one of the first acts of the High Church ministry which followed Godolphin's fall. That the duke was hostile to the Roman catholics is apparent from the satisfaction implied in his letter to Lord Coningsby of February 27, 1703-4, at the fruitlessness of their protests against the act (Ormonde to Coningsby, *ibid.*, p. 719).

<sup>2</sup> 2 Anne, c. 6, Ireland.

<sup>3</sup> 11 & 12 W. III., c. 4.



settled should conform and take the oaths. The insertion of this provision redeems the act from being one of mere religious persecution. From the division of estates equally among the children of papists the political result looked for was, that the aggregation of land in the hands of great owners, with an army of dependants and an implacable hatred of constitutional rule, would be prevented. It was an arrangement which for centuries was the law in Kent; and it was made general in France at the revolution as the equitable ideal which it would now require a second revolution to overturn. But when the bill came back from England in 1704 a clause was found to have been added, that no one in Ireland should be capable of any employment or of being in the magistracy in any city who did not qualify by receiving the sacrament in accordance with the provisions of the English test act. This insertion has been imputed to Godolphin. But a recently published document shews that Godolphin was indifferent on the matter<sup>1</sup> and his behaviour with regard to occasional conformity is evidence that he was not disposed to incur the risk of political collisions for the sake of the dissenters. In England the lay adviser on ecclesiastical affairs was Nottingham.<sup>2</sup> There need scarcely be doubt as to the parentage of the clause.

Subordinate though it was, both to the English privy council and the English parliament, the Irish parliament enjoyed sufficient initiative to give importance and interest to its deliberations and to attract the talent of the educated class, the protestant episcopalians. Notwithstanding the necessity of an ultimate dependence upon England, of which a minority legislating for a nation could not but be sensible, it was not in human nature that the dominant class should view with abject submissiveness the ruin of their country by English interference. There was, indeed, an "English interest," to some of whom, being Englishmen, such an attitude was natural, while others adopted it as profitable to themselves. This party included the officials, with the lord-lieutenant at their head, the greater number of the bishops, who were for the most part

<sup>1</sup> *Ormonde MSS.*, p. 776.

<sup>2</sup> "Lord Nottingham lays his hand on all Church preferment," etc. William Graham, Dean of Carlisle, to his brother, James Graham, Windsor, June 30, 1703, *Bagot MSS.*, p. 337.

CHAP. Englishmen, and some great landlords whose habitual residence was in England. The "Irish interest," which formed the opposition, was for the most part composed of the smaller landowners who, while they recognised that they were regarded by the Celtic race as intruders, yet looked upon themselves as champions of Irish nationality when it came into conflict with English pretensions. They were supported by the very small number of presbyterians in the house, at no time exceeding twelve, whose interests lay in commercial and industrial freedom, and who had suffered directly by English legislation. They also enjoyed the influential alliance of Trinity College. Their leader was William King, who had been translated in 1703 from Derry to the archbishopric of Dublin. In the house of lords the "English interest" was predominant. It was maintained by the spiritual peers, who as a rule outnumbered the laymen owing to the absenteeism of the great landlords. The natural disposition of the upper house, therefore, was to support the ascendancy of the protestant episcopal body as well against the protestant nonconformists as against the Roman catholics.

The spectacle presented by Ireland in 1703 rallied the "Irish interest" in the house of commons in favour of a proposal which, if English commercial jealousy had tolerated its realisation, would have restored more than the prosperity of which the country had been robbed. The house addressed to the queen a "representation" of the grievances of the nation. They recapitulated the disastrous consequences to the protestants of the suppression of the woollen manufacture; they dwelt upon the corruption and absenteeism prevalent among the officials, and they made an alternative demand—either for a restoration "of the full enjoyment of their constitution," which meant the abolition of the control of the English privy council under Poyning's act, or free trade and union with England.

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE NETHERLANDS AND THE PENINSULA.

AT the close of the campaign in December, 1704, Marlborough, by his occupation of Trèves, had disclosed his intention of an invasion of the Moselle district. It became necessary for the French after their severe losses in men and munitions to redistribute their forces. The imperial army, no longer thrown on the defensive, would be free to take the initiative on the Upper Rhine, and, with Landau as a base, to threaten Alsace. The troops of the maritime powers, with their headquarters at Trèves, were free to co-operate with it; while on the other side, between Trèves and the Netherlands, the communications were open. The defence of Alsace was entrusted to Marshal Marsin. As the Margrave of Baden would be the general opposed to him, and the marshal's instructions were to act on the defensive, comparatively little anxiety was felt at Versailles. Greater importance attached to the army of Lorraine, which had its headquarters at Thionville and was commanded by Marshal Villars. It formed a link, corresponding to the allied army at Trèves, between Marsin on the Upper Rhine and Villeroy and Max Emanuel in the Netherlands. Upon this army, it was anticipated, would fall the brunt of Marlborough's attack. On the duke's arrival at the Hague on April 3/14 for the campaign of 1705, he found himself confronted with innumerable difficulties. The Dutch had relapsed into their former nervousness. Five weeks were spent in wrangling ere he could extort assent to his plans. He reckoned that after effecting a junction with the Margrave of Baden, he would be at the head of nearly 90,000 men. Against these the army of Villars was estimated at 60,000. Yet at the end of May the imperialist

CHAP.  
IV.

CHAP. forces had not arrived at Trèves, and his whole force con-  
IV. sisted of but 30,000 English and Dutch. To parry his anticipated invasion of the heart of France, the French resolved on a diversion. In June Villeroy captured in succession both Huy and Liège, and at once a clamour arose among the Dutch for Marlborough's return to the Meuse. He had no choice but to comply. Scarcely had he set out when the Palatine general, Aubach, whom he had left in command of Trèves, surrendered to the French with the provisions and munitions stored there. His plan of campaign was wrecked. He himself, broken with disappointment and illness, expressed a longing to retire.

Villeroy, upon Marlborough's approach, withdrew his army of 70,000 men within the French lines, a formidable barrier, the construction of which had occupied three years. It was in shape an arc, of which Namur was at one, Antwerp at the other extremity. Three rivers, the Great and Little Gheet and the Demer, were connected with elaborate earthworks. It was impossible for Marlborough to allow the enemy to occupy a position which threatened his base. On the night of July 17, having deceived Villeroy by a feint, he forced the lines at the point occupied by the Bavarians, broke their resistance by a cavalry charge headed by himself, and drove the whole French army to retreat upon Louvain. Whether because of Marlborough's weak condition, for he writes on the next day that he could hardly hold his pen, or because the Dutch generals refused to march further,<sup>1</sup> the enemy was not pursued. Had the advantage been hotly pressed, wrote Villeroy to Louis XIV., they must have been destroyed. A number of colours, standards, and cannon and 1,200 prisoners,

<sup>1</sup> This is an assertion of Coxe which Von Noorden (ii., 167) disputes as unconfirmed by Marlborough's correspondence; but one of his field officers, Major Cranstoun, in a long account he gives of these events, says: "I believe it is agreed that he (Ouwerkerk) had sent to tell the duke that his troops were wearied and could not march much farther". Cranstoun also supports the duke's decision to halt by saying that, as Ouwerkerk had not joined him, he might have been attacking the whole French army, the distance of the elector and Villeroy being unknown, with only half his own forces (J. Cranstoun to Robert Cunningham, Herenthals, October 1, 1705, *Portland MSS.*, iv., 250). Lord Orkney, who was in the affair, wrote on July 20: "You cannot believe how it (the enterprise) was opposed by the Dutch"; and, speaking of the failure to pursue, which he imputes to the Dutch, he says that it was "not of my lord's (Marlborough's) fault" (*ibid.*, p. 314).

among them D'Alegre, the Bavarian general, were among the trophies. By the queen the news was welcomed with a public thanksgiving at St. Paul's on August 23.

CHAP.  
IV.

Since his return to the Netherlands, Marlborough had been, in the nominal command of two armies. Of these the larger consisted of the English and the troops in English pay. These were absolutely at his orders. The Dutch army under Ouwerkerk remained the victim of the paralysing system of field-deputies. Its co-operation in forcing the French lines was nothing more than the execution of a feint,<sup>1</sup> of the precise object of which even Ouwerkerk was ignorant. Under such a system, Marlborough complained, it was "impossible to act offensively"; yet urgent representations to the States-general failed to extort any substantial concession.

With characteristic determination to make the best of circumstances, Marlborough resolved to resume the offensive. By August 16 he advanced from Meldert to Genappe so as to threaten Brussels from the south-east. On the 18th the army came in sight of the French forces drawn up in line of battle behind the Yssche to cover Brussels. The allied army was the superior in number. The duke and Ouwerkerk, having reconnoitred the French lines, decided upon four points of attack. To the astonishment of Ouwerkerk and the duke, the field-deputies refused their assent. "They had consulted," wrote the duke's chaplain two days later,<sup>2</sup> "with their other generals, of whom that beast Slangenberg was very noisy and cried out that it was sacrificing their army and an impracticable enterprise." On no previous occasion had Marlborough pressed his purpose so vehemently. From the deputies he addressed an appeal to the Dutch generals and was met by Slangenbourg with insolence. Nothing remained but to withdraw. A war of recrimination ensued. Marlborough wrote an official letter to the States-general, in terms of studious moderation; complaining of his lack of authority over his subordinate generals. The field-deputies issued a counter-manifesto, reflecting upon the duke's concealment of his plans. In England Marlborough's enemies exulted. In France his retreat was

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Francis Hare (Marlborough's chaplain) to G. Naylor, July 18, 1705 Tirlmont, *Hare MSS.*, p. 203, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 1895.

<sup>2</sup> F. Hare to G. Naylor, *Hare MSS.*, p. 205.

CHAP. imputed to incapacity.<sup>1</sup> But the general feeling in Holland  
 IV. and England was one of indignation.<sup>2</sup> "Had he (Slangen-  
 bourg) come to Amsterdam this summer, after he hindered  
 the battle, he would have been De-Witted."<sup>3</sup> Neither the  
 commander-in-chief nor his army was in a condition to renew  
 the campaign that year. "Our army," wrote a field officer in  
 October, "is now very weak, and we have lost this summer  
 in the British troops almost as many men by marauding and  
 desertion, though we have not fought at all, as we lost last  
 summer though we had two bloody battles."<sup>4</sup> Beginning every-  
 where with promise, the campaign had ended everywhere in  
 disappointment.

During the autumn increasing dissatisfaction with the war  
 had been felt by the Dutch. The stoppage of the exchange  
 robbed them, they urged, of the means of contributing to the  
 cost. Indeed, not even after their undertaking in 1703 was the  
 prohibition faithfully observed, and in 1704 the States-general  
 did not venture to extend it for another year. Unless, wrote  
 the grand pensionary early in 1705, England wished a dis-  
 solution of the alliance it must withdraw all obstacles to trade  
 with France. English merchants and shipowners grumbled,  
 tory pamphleteers assailed the ministry, ministers complained  
 at the Hague. But the Hague had its grievances also. Eng-  
 land, it was whispered, was cajoling from the Austrian claimant  
 the concession of exclusive trade privileges in Spain and the  
 West Indies. England meditated the annexation of Gibraltar,  
 of the harbour of Cadiz, and of a station on the Balearic Isles  
 which would give her the monopoly of the Mediterranean trade.  
 No wonder, cried the peace party of Amsterdam, that England  
 clamoured for a war which should so richly compensate her  
 sacrifices. But the disclosure of the misconduct of Slangen-  
 bourg and the general discredit of the field-deputies had pro-

<sup>1</sup> "J'ai obtenu une opinion médiocre de la capacité du duc de Marlborough." Chamillart (minister of war) to Villeroy, September 6, 1705, Von Noorden, ii., 173.

<sup>2</sup> For the remonstrance which it was in contemplation to send to the States-general by Lord Pembroke, see *The Queen to the Earl of Pembroke*, August 30, 1705, *Portland MSS.*, iv., 237.

<sup>3</sup> *Duke of Shrewsbury's Journal*, December 15, 1705, *Buccleuch MSS.*, ii., 796.

<sup>4</sup> Major J. Cranstoun to Robert Cunningham, Herenthals, October 1, 1705. *Portland MSS.*, iv., 255. Marlborough particularises fatigue and sickness. *Murray, Dispatches*, ii., 290.

voked a reaction in Dutch sentiment. Even William Buys, the leader of the peace party, after a visit to London in January, 1706, returned to Amsterdam fervent for the alliance.

Upon the conclusion of the indecisive campaign of 1705 Marlborough again undertook the work of a diplomatist, and as Vienna was now the weak point of the alliance, he determined in November, 1705, there to deal with the emperor personally. He assured him of an English loan, and met his difficulties by agreeing to a reduction of the imperial contingent for the ensuing campaign to 40,000 men, but he insisted that these should be punctually dispatched and adequately equipped. At Vienna he met his son-in-law Sunderland, who, in July, had been appointed envoy-extraordinary to felicitate Joseph I. on his accession, and to act as intermediary between the court of Vienna and the Hungarian insurgents. In Sunderland's company he proceeded from Vienna to Berlin. Frederick was complaining of slights offered by the emperor and threatening to withdraw his 8,000 soldiers from Italy. Not until the States-general paid his arrears would he order his regiments to march to the seat of war on the Rhine. Having effected a continuance of the agreement for the Italian campaign of the ensuing year, which was his main object, Marlborough next proceeded to Hanover. Here his manners, which the electress described as "obliging and polished," reconciled her to the English court. Thence to the Hague, where he arranged for the payment of the States-general's contribution to the supply of Prince Eugene's army, and for his reinforcement with 10,000 men, to be raised from Saxe-Gotha and the Rhenish Palatinate and paid by the maritime powers. On January 7, 1706, he resumed his seat in parliament and received the thanks of the house of commons for his services.

The spring of 1706 was marked by a distraction of counsels among the allies. The States-general peremptorily refused to listen to Marlborough's project of marching a Dutch force into Italy. If he insisted on an Italian campaign, he must forgo the co-operation of the Dutch troops and resign his position as commander-in-chief of the republic's army. The war in Italy was accordingly reserved for Prince Eugene who, by the defeat of the Duke of Orleans under the walls of Turin on September 7, dealt the third of the three great blows inflicted that

CHAP. year on France. The relief of Turin was the loss of Italy to  
IV. France. Vast preparations were in the meanwhile being made by Louis XIV. Villars was entrusted with the command of an army on the Upper Rhine; in the centre of the theatre of war, between the Netherlands and Alsace, lay Marsin; on the Dutch frontier Villeroy and Max Emanuel. The Margrave of Baden, intrenched behind the lines of Hagenau in Alsace, was left with less than 7,000 ill-equipped troops, and on April 30 driven from his position with the loss of all his supplies by a surprise attack of Villars and Marsin. As far as the co-operation of the imperial forces went, the campaign was over before it was begun. At the end of May Marlborough placed himself at the head of the allied forces in Brabant, numbering 60,000 men. His immediate object was to strike a blow before Marsin, who was on the march from Metz, succeeded in effecting a junction with Villeroy. Marsin's advanced detachment of twenty squadrons of cavalry was within two days' march on May 21, and his infantry some few days' marches behind. Common prudence would have prescribed to Villeroy the avoidance of an engagement, but jealousy prompted him to precipitate one before Marsin's arrival.<sup>1</sup>

The two armies met in the neighbourhood of Ramillies, a village eleven miles north of Namur. The field of battle was a convex tract of land between the river Mehaigne on the south and the sources of the Great and Little Gheet. In the morning of May 23, N.S., the advance guards came in contact, Marlborough marching from the east and Villeroy from the north. Villeroy had time to take up the position of his choice. At his centre, Ramillies, he posted his artillery. His left wing was protected by marshy and broken ground. In front of his centre and right was a plain on which his cavalry, now joined by Marsin's detachment, could manœuvre. In advance of his right was the village of Tavier, and beyond it Franquemies, both of which would have to be taken before his position could be turned. Marlborough placed his infantry in the centre, in front of Ramillies, and his cavalry on either flank. A demonstration was made by him against the French

<sup>1</sup> "We could hardly fail of meeting, since we marched with a firm resolution to attack them, and I find they did the same out of their line to attack us." Letter of the Earl of Orkney, May 24, 1706, *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, xix., 315.



left, the English infantry wading waist deep in water to the attack. But a furious assault on Ramillies<sup>1</sup> was repulsed, and the Dutch were scattered by the French cavalry on the plain. While rallying the Dutch horse, Marlborough was dismounted<sup>2</sup> and in danger of being taken prisoner. As at Blenheim, failure inspired him. He executed a change of disposition which determined the battle. Villeroy had been led by the demonstration against his left to withdraw troops from his right. As he did so, Marlborough withdrew half his infantry to his centre, rapidly transferred the cavalry to his left wing and, Franquénies having been already stormed by the Dutch, threw his reserves upon Tavier. The French were outnumbered and their cavalry routed, while at the same time the English and Dutch infantry pierced the French centre. The French right was now turned and the army driven into a retreat which became a rout. With the exception of six guns, the entire French artillery was taken. The victory cost the allies 1,000 killed and some 2,600 wounded; the French and Bavarians lost 12,000 to 15,000 men killed, wounded, prisoners, and deserters. Their confidence and discipline were shattered.

After several futile efforts to rally, the defeated army dispersed among the fortresses of the French frontier. Brabant lay at the feet of the victor. Antwerp and Dendermonde were the only places of importance in Brabant which had not surrendered within eleven days of the battle. On June 6 Antwerp, a fortress of such strength that its investment had been proposed by the States-general in 1703 as the sole objective of the campaign, opened its gates, the French garrison being allowed to march out with the honours of war. In the opinion of military experts it would have been feasible for Marlborough at this abysmal crisis of the fortunes of France—for the relief of Barcelona had taken place on May 12 and the French troops had been driven out of Spain—to have marched straight upon Paris. But it would have been idle for him to propose such an enterprise to the States-general. Now that Flanders and Brabant were assured to

<sup>1</sup> "That post was attacked very furiously by chiefly stranger troops, except Churchill's and Mordaunt's regiments, who have suffered greatly." Lord Orkney, *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, xix., 315.

<sup>2</sup> "My Lord Marlbro' was rid over." *Ibid.*

CHAP. them, their ambitions travelled no farther than the fortified  
IV, towns of French Flanders and of Hainault. They fought for safety and profit, not for idle glory.

That the success of Ramillies was to be utilised by the reduction of fortified towns was adopted, therefore, as common ground between the maritime powers. Ouwerkerk undertook the siege of Ostend, while Marlborough with an army at Roselaere, where he could threaten Ypres and Menin, covered the operations. On July 6, after a bombardment by sea and land, Ostend capitulated; and a place which in the preceding century had held out for three years and cost Spinola 80,000 men was acquired at the sacrifice of 500 lives. Leaving Nieuport and Dunkirk, a step by which, if he disappointed his own countrymen, he gratified the Dutch, Marlborough, reinforced by Ouwerkerk, moved eastwards, surprised Courtray and established a fortified camp at Helchen, on the Upper Schelde, whence he could threaten the line of fortresses of the northern frontier of France. Vendôme, who in August had replaced Villeroy, could do no more than intrench his demoralised troops and watch the allies. One after another the fortresses fell, until by November, when the army went into winter quarters, none of the Belgian fortified towns remained to France save Mons, Charleroi, Namur, and Luxembourg.

By a clause in the treaty of the Grand Alliance it was stipulated that the acquisitions made in the Spanish Netherlands should be utilised as a "barrier" between the United Provinces and France. As it was not proposed to withdraw the towns of the barrier from the sovereignty of Spain, which was unable to defend them, a strong barrier was nominally advantageous to that crown as well as to the republic. But while the Dutch were willing to concede to the house of Austria, as succeeding to the rights of Charles II. of Spain, the honour of sovereignty, the burden of judicial responsibility, and a joint scheme of defence, their real object was to make the barrier fortresses dependent on the United Provinces, contributory to their expenditure, and useful to their trade. The wholesale surrenders which followed the battle of Ramillies brought this matter to a crisis. Marlborough was conscious that Dutch annexation on a large scale would excite jealousy in England, and that it "would certainly set the

whole country (*i.e.* the Spanish Netherlands) against them". He insisted that the occupation of the Belgian provinces should be in the name of Charles III. To prevent the change of masters proving merely a substitution of Dutch for French officialism, he encouraged the revival of the States of Flanders and Brabant, proclaiming in the name of Charles III. the restoration of the ancient liberties and privileges suppressed by the French. The policy of this treatment, contrasted with the harsh absolutism of their late masters, so rallied the population to his support that he found himself able to enlist a Belgian army corps in the joint service of the maritime powers. These liberal measures ill accorded with the traditional policy of the court of Vienna; but the emperor's interference having been repudiated by the Dutch, he affected to accept the situation and nominated Marlborough, on behalf of Charles III., governor of the Netherlands. The bait was gilded with a promised salary of £60,000 a year. Fortunate it was, wrote Heinsius, that Marlborough had subjected his acceptance to the approval of the Dutch. The effect of the proposal upon them was to awaken bitter resentment against Austria, suspicion against England, and a determination to force the allies to a prompt settlement of the barrier. Whatever selection they might make in the Spanish Netherlands of towns to receive their garrisons should be recognised as their barrier, and as such guaranteed to them in possession by England. "By that proposal," wrote Halifax, the British special envoy, to Portland, "the Dutch have desired the whole Spanish Netherlands."<sup>1</sup> He returned indignant to England, and the management of negotiations was entrusted to the calmer diplomacy of Marlborough. The Dutch determined to meet the advent of peace with accomplished facts. Despite Marlborough's protests they endeavoured to obliterate the signs of English *condominium* in Belgium, and treated the occupied provinces as their own. In September, after repeated expostulations and warnings, the duke insisted that side by side with a Dutch commissioner a special English commissioner should be entrusted with the administration of the Spanish Netherlands. He proposed George Stepney, who, after a quarrel with the imperial minister Count

<sup>1</sup> September 24-October 5, 1706, *Heinsius' Archives*, Von Noorden, ii., 350, n. 1.

CHAP. IV. Wratislaw, had recently been recalled from Vienna. The States-general had no choice but to accept the nomination.

The French, who were well informed of the course of events in Holland, judged the moment of tension between Marlborough and the Dutch to be favourable to their project of disintegrating the Alliance. In the middle of August, a clearly formulated offer of terms was unofficially put before the leading Dutch politicians by an agent of the war minister Chamillart. The Dutch could take possession of the entire Spanish Netherlands and enjoy a preferential tariff at the French custom houses. In England the anticipation of a separate accommodation of Holland with France aroused general irritation. The Dutch plea of financial pressure was met by Godolphin with the observation that Holland like England could "borrow money at four or five per cent., whereas the finances of France are so much more exhausted that they are forced to give twenty and twenty-five per cent. for every penny they send out of the kingdom, unless they send it in specie, by which means they have neither money nor credit".<sup>1</sup> Whig merchants were jealous that the Dutch should secure a most-favoured-nation treaty. Whig politicians feared that with the cessation of the military successes which had helped them to a majority at the general election of May, 1705, the tory party would revive and the protestant succession be placed in jeopardy. On September 14, Godolphin sent Buys a dispatch upon the French proposals. He insisted that the Dutch should "specify the particular towns which they propose to have for their barrier". It was not in the power of France to concede them. As England had the power, so she would control the terms of a general peace. Perceiving the failure of his attempt to lure the Dutch from the alliance by golden promises, Louis XIV. next endeavoured to approach Marlborough through the Elector of Bavaria. The elector wrote to the duke and the Dutch field-deputies proposing public conferences on the terms of a peace. The English

<sup>1</sup> Godolphin to Marlborough, October 4-15, 1706, Coxe, *Memoirs of Marlborough*, i., 486. A few days after this letter was written the government received from one of their spies in Paris, Captain John Ogilvie, a report which justifies Godolphin's view. Paris, November 19-30, 1706, *Portland MSS.*, iv., 354.

cabinet and the States-general replied through Marlborough that conferences at large were futile until the allies had concerted among themselves the preliminaries of their demands. At the head of these they agreed to set the renunciation by the Duke of Anjou (Philip V.) of the entire Spanish inheritance. That the States-general should have consented to this condition was another Ramillies won by the duke in the field of diplomacy. With a sarcastic comment from Torcy<sup>1</sup> the French ministers retired discomfited.

During the winter of 1704-5 Methuen and Galway made preparations for a campaign on the western frontier of Spain. The forces at the disposal of the allies numbered 2,300 Dutch, 12,000 Portuguese, and 2,700 English. The evils of a mixed army made themselves apparent from the outset. Galway desired an assault upon the capital fortress of Badajoz before Tessé could march with his troops from Gibraltar. He was overruled by the Portuguese, who preferred the investment of the minor stronghold of Valenza. The allies having captured Valenza and Albuquerque, encamped before Badajoz in June, 1705. By that time Tessé had arrived with reinforcements. Months were spent in futile disputes between the generals. Galway, the most enterprising of them, lost his right arm by a cannon shot. In October the Dutch general, Fagel, having been surprised by Tessé, the allies abandoned the siege.

The ancient kingdoms of Aragon and Valencia and the province of Catalonia had long borne with impatience the Castilian supremacy established by Philip II. For them Madrid was the common enemy. Aware of the prevalence of this feeling, which was greatly exaggerated by the Austrian party in Spain, the English ministry in 1705 resolved on another expedition to its eastern coasts. The commander nominated was Charles Mordaunt, Earl of Peterborough. It was a surprising selection in that age, for he was not a soldier of experience, having for five years enjoyed a sinecure colonelcy of foot as a reward for political services. He had, however, in 1687 held the command of a small Dutch squadron in the West Indies, and had been nominated commander-in-chief of

<sup>1</sup> Torcy to Hennequin, a Dutch intermediary, December 5, 1706, G. G. Vreede, *Correspondance diplomatique et militaire de Marlborough, Heinsius, etc.*, Amsterdam, 1850, p. 182.

CHAP. a projected Dutch and English expedition to Jamaica in De-  
IV. cember, 1702. This enterprise having been abandoned, owing to the reluctance of the Dutch, his present nomination was in the nature of a compensation to him. He owed it to his adroitness in paying court to the Duchess of Marlborough. Mindful of the mischiefs which had attended the divided command of the naval and military forces by Rooke and the Duke of Ormonde in the Cadiz expedition, Peterborough secured, in addition to his commission as general, a commission with Sir Cloudisley Shovell as joint admiral of the fleet. Including Leake's squadron at Lisbon, the fleet consisted of sixty-six sail of the line, of which fourteen were Dutch. The land force was made up of three English, three Irish, and four Dutch regiments, and numbered 6,500 men. Prince George of Hesse-Darmstadt was on board the fleet, together with the candidate of the allies for the crown of Spain, the Archduke Charles. The army disembarked near Barcelona on August 24, 1705, and was joined by 1,200 Catalan volunteers locally known as "miquelets".

The influence which Prince George's acquaintance with the country and the people naturally gave him was regarded by Peterborough, a man intoxicated by vanity, with an insane jealousy. He convened a council of English and Dutch generals on August 27, declared that the capture of Barcelona was impracticable, and proposed a march upon Valencia. But the allied expedition now numbered nearly 10,000 soldiers, besides 3,000 miquelets, and a fleet of 24,000 seamen. Barcelona was held by a garrison of Spaniards and Neapolitans, of whom the Spaniards were known to be disaffected to Philip V.; nor had it any prospect of relief. The archduke and Shovell therefore supported Prince George. After many councils of war it was determined that the attempt on Barcelona should be relinquished, and that the army should march on Valencia. But on August 13, the day after this decision was arrived at, Peterborough consented to an attempt by Prince George<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> According to Lord Stanhope, the credit of the inception of this enterprise belongs to Peterborough. But Stanhope founds his narrative upon Carleton's (as to which, see App. ii.). He has also himself detracted from the probability of his version by the admission that Peterborough was adverse to a stay at Barcelona; and lastly, the journal, which Stanhope does not appear to have seen, of Major-General John Richards, who was at the conferences between Darm-

to surprise Montjuich, a detached fort on a hill above the sea, about 1,100 yards south of Barcelona. On September 14, Prince George selected 1,000 men for the enterprise, Peterborough remaining in the rear with the reserves. Montjuich was defended by a garrison of about 200 Neapolitans. The assailants, whose attack was to be delivered from the landward or south-west side, having mistaken their road, did not arrive till broad daylight. They were repulsed with considerable loss, and Prince George was killed. Peterborough rallied them, and they took shelter behind the earthworks whence they could annoy the garrison. Meanwhile a force of miquelets, by the capture of the intermediate work called St. Bertran, cut off the prospects of succour from Barcelona. On the 17th the powder magazine blew up and the garrison surrendered. As the inaction of Velasco, the governor of Barcelona, shewed that he did not trust his troops, the allies determined to make a serious attack on the city. A breach having been effected, Velasco capitulated and was accorded the honours of war.

The consequences of these successes were quickly seen. The Count of Cifuentes raided Aragon. In the kingdom of Valencia and in Catalonia several strong places sent in their surrenders, and the city of Valencia rose against the Madrid governor. Peterborough, like a knight-errant, rode through Catalonia in January, 1706, with a handful of horsemen, taking possession of towns. The east had rebelled against the west of Spain. Philip V. was helpless. Tessé, who commanded the bulk of his forces, was confronted at Badajoz by Das Minas and the allies. To march eastwards would be to leave Castile open to the Anglo-Portuguese army. And Castile was wavering. The defection of Portugal and Savoy and the victory of Blenheim, followed by the catastrophe in the east of Spain, had seriously changed the outlook. Louis XIV. awoke to the crisis. He dispatched 9,000 men under General Légal to the northern frontier of Catalonia and ordered Tessé to concentrate the Bourbon troops in Aragon (January, 1706). Meanwhile, Peterborough, having quarrelled with "the wretches of Barcelona,"<sup>1</sup> that is, the Archduke Charles in particular and

stadt and Peterborough, conclusively establishes the secondary part which Peterborough really played.

<sup>1</sup> Lord Peterborough to Lord —, January 11, 1706, *Morrison MSS.*, p. 467, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 1895.

CHAP. his German advisers in general, had scattered his troops through  
 IV. Catalonia and Valencia, leaving a garrison of only 1,400 men in Barcelona. The English fleet having sailed homewards in October, the French next spring seized the opportunity. On April 1, 1706, a powerful fleet under the Count of Toulouse anchored before Barcelona, while a land force of 21,000 men, under the nominal command of Philip V., invested the city. Montjuich was taken by storm on the 25th. Only the arrival of Leake with an English and Dutch fleet of fifty-two line of battle ships, before which the French fleet took to flight, saved Barcelona from recapture. Peterborough had endeavoured to divert Leake's fleet by orders sent to Lisbon to make for the Grao, the harbour of Valencia, adding that he hoped "to march on Madrid". Leake, however, receiving urgent messages from the beleaguered archduke to hasten to his relief, and reflecting that the occupation of Madrid by Peterborough would not countervail the capture by the French of the allies' candidate for the throne, determined, with the concurrence of his officers, to risk disobedience to Peterborough's orders. Peterborough, therefore, adroitly changed his plan, made his way in an open boat to Leake's ship, hoisted his flag as admiral, and posed as the saviour of Barcelona, which, if his orders had been obeyed, would have been lost. Tessé and Philip V. retreated to Roussillon, leaving behind them large stores and munitions of war. The moral effect was immense, for there was now but one king, Charles III., in Spain. Peterborough was glorified as a second Marlborough, and the relief of Barcelona was celebrated with the victory of Ramillies by a public thanksgiving at St. Paul's on June 27.

The withdrawal at the end of 1705 of the greater part of the French troops from the western frontier of Spain to join Tessé in Aragon offered an opportunity for an advance by the Anglo-Portuguese army under Galway and Das Minas. Their total force amounted to 19,000 men, of whom 2,000 were English and 2,000 Dutch. The English cavalry numbered 200 only, the Portuguese 3,600. Opposed to them was Marshal Berwick with 15,300 Spanish infantry and 4,000 horse. Berwick, a master of retreats, drew back before the allies, who captured the important fortress of Ciudad Rodrigo on May 26. Galway learning on the 27th the defeat of



Tessé, with great difficulty persuaded the Portuguese to march with him on Madrid. Berwick made no attempt to defend the passes of the Guadarrama range, but the population was hostile to the invaders, the roads difficult and provisions scarce, while Das Minas was sulkily threatening to return and the Portuguese soldiers were deserting. Galway himself was ill with gout, and, never having recovered strength since the loss of his arm, had to be lifted on horseback. Had Berwick offered battle, the numbers of both armies being approximately equal, the issue must have been perilous for the invaders. As he continued to retreat, Galway and Das Minas made a triumphant entry into Madrid on June 27, and proclaimed Charles III. Thence Galway sent dispatches to Charles and Peterborough, urging an immediate advance.

In Madrid the soldiers of the allied army, amid a sullenly hostile population, compensated themselves by excess for the privations of their march. A fourth of their number found their way into the hospitals. On July 11 Galway marched out of Madrid, and Berwick, retreating before him, encamped on the 15th at Guadalaxara. Here he received dispatches announcing the march of Charles and his arrival at Saragossa. On July 28, Berwick was reinforced from Navarre by Légal at the head of a French army of 2,300 horse and 9,000 foot. His entire force now numbered 25,000 men. It was the opinion of Berwick that the delays of Galway and Das Minas at Madrid and in the camp of Guadalaxara ruined the fortunes of the Archduke Charles in Spain. Galway's illness, the want of enterprise of Das Minas, and the quarrels of the two gave Berwick the needed interval in which to form his army. At the beginning of July they could have driven him beyond the Ebro; towards the end of the month he was in a position to open the offensive with a superior force.

A council of war held at Barcelona on May 18 had decided that Peterborough, starting from Valencia, should clear the roads to Madrid, and afterwards, accompanied by the archduke and at the head of 8,000 men, join hands with Galway's army. At the parliamentary inquiry of 1711, Peterborough bitterly complained that he had received no adequate equipment for his undertaking. But on July 6, he announced the road to Madrid clear both of hostile walls and of hostile troops,

CHAP. and urged the archduke by letter to start from Barcelona at  
IV. once<sup>1</sup> and join him at Valencia. In the meanwhile, the insurrection in favour of the Austrian candidate had been spreading through Aragon, and, despite the protests of Peterborough and of General Stanhope, his official English adviser, Charles elected to proceed to Saragossa. In this choice, his strained relations with Peterborough were decisive.<sup>2</sup> Charles knew also of the fall of Madrid and that Galway and Das Minas were expecting him by the route through Saragossa. He could neither anticipate the dilatoriness of those generals nor the rapidity with which Berwick could re-form his army. For six weeks Peterborough remained sulking or pursuing his gallantries at Valencia, until peremptory orders compelled him to join the archduke. On August 5 the two effected a junction with Galway at Guadalaxara at the head of 5,000 men. The camp now contained three generals whose precedence was unsettled and whose powers were indeterminate, each animated by jealousy of the other. Charles and his German advisers, whom Peterborough hated and ridiculed, treated Peterborough with studied contempt. Perceiving the situation impossible for him, he communicated to Charles a dispatch from Secretary Hedges, of June 19-30, directing him, if it could be done, to proceed to the assistance of the Duke of Savoy, then concerting operations for the relief of Turin. The idea was gratefully seized upon by Charles and the allied generals, who were weary of his arrogance and factiousness. Charles entrusted him with a commission to raise £100,000 at Genoa, by way of loan upon mortgage of Spanish territory, and suggested that on his return he should attempt the reduction of Minorca. On

<sup>1</sup> In the *Memoirs* of Lord Walpole, the story is told that when Charles excused his delay in setting out for Saragossa on the plea that his state coach was not ready for his entry into the Aragonese capital, Stanhope replied: "Sir, the Prince of Orange entered London in a coach and four, with a cloak bag behind him, and was made king not many weeks after". This anecdote has been dismissed by Heller in the *Oesterr. militär. Zeitschrift* (1839) as a fiction, but it finds confirmation in a letter from a person in Peterborough's suite among the Duke of Marlborough's papers at Blenheim Palace, dated Alicant, September 3, 1706: "The king said it was not for his catholic honour to go without his retinue. Mr. Stanhope told him K. William went post in a Hackney coach with a few dragoons to London, or else he had lost the crown. However, folly prevailed," etc. *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 8th Rep., App., p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Wratislaw to Marlborough, August 21, 1706, Von Noorden, ii., 412, n. 5.

September 15 he left Valencia for Italy. The reinforced French and Castilian army, under Berwick, reoccupied Madrid on August 4 amid the applause of the population. Nothing remained for the archduke's army, reduced by disease and desertions at Guadalaxara to 14,000 men, but to beat a retreat. Cut off by Berwick from Portugal, they turned eastwards. Struggling through a country already exhausted by war, enfeebled by sickness and privations, exposed to a sun so fierce "that the barrels of their guns burnt their fingers,"<sup>1</sup> and harassed by the guerrilla warfare of the peasantry of Castile, they re-entered Valencia, a rabble of 10,000 men.

A belief had long been propagated in England that not only in Languedoc was exasperation acute at the religious persecutions and tyrannical suppressions of local self-government by Louis XIV. An ex-abbé of noble French family, preferring the life of adventure to that of seclusion, had quitted his benefices and, being a former friend of Prince Eugene, had made his way to Vienna, where he became a lieutenant-general in the imperial army, assuming the title of Marquis de Guiscard. From Vienna he went to the Hague with an introduction to Heinsius. Thence he issued manifestos calling upon his countrymen to rise against Louis and absolutism, and there he made the acquaintance of Marlborough, and, through Marlborough, of St. John. To St. John, as secretary at war, he presented plans for a descent on the coast of France. It does not appear that Marlborough went further into the matter than to give the idea his general approval, to nominate Earl Rivers as commander of the expedition, and to urge the States-general to contribute some naval and military assistance. He could have no knowledge of the fundamental misconception on which the whole enterprise was based, that the French population of Saintonge and Guienne was ready to rise for their forgotten liberties.<sup>2</sup>

The States-general assented to Marlborough's request.

<sup>1</sup> R. Palmer to Lord Fermanagh, Nov. 19, 1706, *Verney MSS.*, p. 507, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 7th Rep., App.

<sup>2</sup> The queen's instructions to Earl Rivers are printed in the *Bath MSS.* i., 84, dated July 21, 1706. He is to issue "manifestoes," "taking care to give assurances to the people, and to make it public that his design is not for conquest, but to restore to all sorts of people their ancient rights and privileges". The manifestos were prepared in London. H. St. John to Secretary Harley, Portsmouth, July 27, 1706, *ibid.*, p. 85.

CHAP. IV. Escorted by a guard of horse-grenadiers, Guiscard, in the company of St. John, arrived at Portsmouth at the end of July. But when preparations were completed, a continuance of unfavourable winds prevented the sailing of the fleet. A council of war, held at Torbay under Shovell, on August 13, 1706, concluded that the delay had imperilled the prospects of the enterprise,<sup>1</sup> and, after consultation with Godolphin, it was determined that the destination of the expedition should be Cadiz. It was not until October that the expedition set sail from Torbay, the destination of the fleet being kept secret. Buffeted by tempestuous weather, in consequence of which no fewer than half the horses were dead or ruined,<sup>2</sup> the ships were forced to rendezvous at Lisbon. Here Rivers received a dispatch from Secretary Hedges that the extremity to which the allies at Valencia were reduced necessitated his abandonment of the expedition against Cadiz in favour of a junction with the archduke. The correspondence which follows<sup>3</sup> is a painful exhibition of petty pique on the part of Rivers and infirmity of purpose on that of the ministry. He was instructed to serve under Galway. He not only tendered his resignation on the ground that he had expected an independent command, he brought absurd charges against Galway of clandestine correspondence with the enemy in association with John Methuen, the English ambassador at Lisbon, who had recently died. Galway, foreseeing a second Peterborough, advised the ministry to instruct him to combine with the Portuguese in an invasion of Spain from the west. "The most pernicious advice ever given the queen," wrote Rivers to Halifax on December 31, O.S., "which in my Lord Galway could not be ignorance." In this spirit he determined to go to Valencia.

<sup>1</sup> According to Tindal, a careful collector of facts, Guiscard was sent back to London by Rivers under the discredit of having furnished untrustworthy information as to the prospects of the descent in France. But this is confuted by the publication from the *Bath MSS.* of the correspondence between Godolphin and Rivers. On August 24, 1706, Godolphin wrote to Rivers: "As for Monsieur de Guiscard, since it is by no fault of his that his project is laid aside, it seems not unreasonable that he should be at liberty to serve upon this expedition, or not, as he shall incline to most" (*Bath MSS.*, i., 93). The letters of Lord Rivers show that he disliked Guiscard, and wished to have nothing to do with him (Rivers to Godolphin, August 21, 1706, *ibid.*, p. 92). And Guiscard was employed again.

<sup>2</sup> Earl Rivers to Sir C. Hedges, Lisbon, October 29, 1706, O.S., *ibid.*, p. 116.

<sup>3</sup> *Bath MSS.*, i., 117-66.

## CHAPTER V.

### THE UNION WITH SCOTLAND.

DURING the hundred years that had passed since the accession of James VI. of Scotland to the English crown, the project of constitutional union between the two countries had fitfully occupied men's minds, and with a more constant pressure during the latter years of William III. Among Scottish parties the one best affected to a union was that of the episcopalians who were not Jacobites, and who frequently went by the name of the cavaliers. Their hope was to replace the presbyterian by an episcopal establishment. On this point, the whigs were opposed to them. Those who are familiar with the vituperative pages of the antiquary, Hearne, will remember that presbyterian and whig figure as synonymous terms. A third body of politicians existed, recruited from the left centre of the whigs. The introduction of Italian phrases into the politics of the day was a fashionable taste. It smacked of the *grand tour*. The *squadron volante* of the Scots parliament were zealous for the protestant succession, but they saw in it not an opportunity for a consolidation of the two kingdoms but for the government of Scotland as an independent nation under its noble families, over which an exotic dynasty would be likely to exercise no more than a nominal control. This "flying squadron" naturally rallied the great landowners and held the balance of politics. A number of fractions composed the opposition, obstinately conservative of all the national institutions. On the one hand were the covenanters, whose ideal was a republic and whose horror was an episcopacy; on the other the Jacobites, who after Anne's accession gradually absorbed the episcopalians,<sup>1</sup> ready

CHAP.  
V.

<sup>1</sup> "The Jacobite party (in Scotland) whether popish or episcopal it matters little." Daniel De Foe to the Earl of Oxford, *Portland MSS.*, v., 82.

CHAP. V. to acquiesce even in a Roman catholic prelacy if imposed by a native hereditary king.<sup>1</sup>

To the statesmen of both countries who were desirous of smoothing the constant friction arising from these relations, the accession of Anne, a sovereign of the ancient Stewart line, seemed an auspicious opportunity. On August 25, 1702, commissioners were appointed to treat on the part of England with commissioners from Scotland with a view to a union. The two commissions met on October 22. The future position of the presbyterian establishment, the admission of Scotland to the English colonial trade, the share of Scotland in the liabilities of the two nations, lastly, the extension to Scotland of the internal taxation of England, were all discussed. But the negotiations were wrecked, partly upon the collision of interests between the Scots company trading to Africa and the Indies, partly upon the reluctance shown by Scotland to the adoption of the English system of excise. In the new Scottish parliament summoned for May, 1703, the extreme opposition, the Jacobites and the republican covenanters, found themselves more numerous than before. At the head of the Jacobites was the restless Duke of Hamilton. Fletcher of Saltoun, a speculative republican, was spokesman of the other wing of the opposition. Of the Duke of Hamilton no man felt sure. He was suspected of a design to put himself forward as a Scottish pretender, founding himself on the profession of protestantism and his connexion with the Stewarts.<sup>2</sup> He was believed to be intriguing with St. Germain's. He was known to be making professions to the government.<sup>3</sup>

At the head of the party for union stood the Duke of Queensberry, a recruit from the Tories. Perceiving that the "flying squadron" had been reduced by the elections, he set himself to strengthen it by the customary means by which in the seventeenth century richer countries had acquired political interest with their poorer neighbours.<sup>4</sup> In addition to the

<sup>1</sup> Letter of Henrietta, Marchioness of Huntley, June 20, 1712, *Portland MSS.*, v., 186.

<sup>2</sup> (G. Lamberty) to Lord Cutts, August 4-15, 1703, *Astley MSS.*, p. 128, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 1900. Cf. Bonet's Correspondence, July 24, 1703, Von Noorden, i., 517, 2. See also Col. Hooke and Torcy, 9 July, 1707. R.O. Paris Transcripts, vol. 54, 71.

<sup>3</sup> *Bagot MSS.*, p. 341, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 1885.

<sup>4</sup> Earl of Nottingham to James Graham, August 31, 1703, Whitehall: "I hear that great sums of money have lately been sent into that kingdom". *Ibid.*, p. 337.

peers who joined the squadron for substantial considerations paid down, it had the more trustworthy support of the traditional whigs, of the Duke of Argyll, of the Lords Marchmont and Tweeddale, and of a group of officials who had held office under King William. Nevertheless, the opposition soon shewed that it controlled the majority. The queen's message on May 6 recommended a settlement of the Scottish crown. It was doubtful to no one that this implied a settlement on the precedent of the English Act of Succession. But the consciousness of this was as oil to the fire of the opposition. They were not merely satisfied with taking up the question as if on their own initiative, in jealous independence of the message from St. James's. The "Act for the Security of the Kingdom," currently known as the Act of Security, carried by the opposition through parliament, paid a tribute to national vanity in its provision that on the queen's death the estates should appoint a protestant successor to the crown descended from the old line of sovereigns.

This in itself was a contemptuous disregard of the royal message. Yet the Act of Security went further. It excluded from succession to the crown of Scotland the successor to the crown of England unless "there be such conditions of government settled and enacted as may secure the honour and sovereignty of this crown and kingdom—the freedom, frequency, and power of parliaments, the religion, liberty, and trade of the nation, from the English or any foreign influence". The queen's commissioner, the Duke of Queensberry, refused to give the royal assent by the touch of the sceptre to this audacious defiance. One other act of the same tendency was passed intituled "an Act anent Peace and War". By this it was provided that after the death of Anne the sovereign should be debarred from proclaiming war without the consent of parliament. This measure received the royal assent on September 16, 1703. English parties and the English ministry accepted these messages of defiance with unconcerned indifference. Godolphin regarded the Scots as people of punctilio,<sup>1</sup> and was of opinion, justified by experience, that punctilio had

<sup>1</sup> "I wish there were no such thing upon earth as a punctilio of any kind." Godolphin to Harley on the Scots' demands as to the composition of the commissions for union, April 8, 1705, *Bath MSS.*, i., 67.

CHAP. V. its price. It was currently said in English political circles that the Scots Estates could be bought for £30,000,<sup>1</sup> and Godolphin had the credit of declaring that he would prorogue them until the bargain and sale were concluded.<sup>2</sup>

The circulation of stories of this sort from the parliament of Edinburgh to the country-side, and the unpopularity which attended the Duke of Queensberry's conduct in the matter of "the Scotch plot," excited popular resentment against England. A universal agitation began. During the winter of 1703-4 riotous mobs paraded the streets of Edinburgh. The pulpit thundered with declamations against prelacy; the Highlands seethed with disaffection, and the rumour ran round that a force from Dunkirk was ready to support a rising.<sup>3</sup> The Marquis of Tweeddale, a member of the "flying squadron," had replaced Queensberry as high commissioner. When the estates met on July 6, 1704, they again passed the Act of Security, and notwithstanding the previous refusal of the royal assent, without debate. As if to extort the submission of the English government, they further enacted the calling out of the militia and the general arming of the nation; a measure also supported by those who wished well to the union for the reason that it afforded some security against an invasion from the Highlands in the Jacobite interest. These bills they tacked to a money bill granting six months' supply for the payment of the army, then greatly in arrears.

Ministers in Scotland found themselves in a serious difficulty. The army, 3,000 strong, was unpaid; there was no money in the Scots treasury, and there would be none until either the tack was taken off, for which there was no constitutional device, or the Act of Security was passed. The only remaining alternative—that the English treasury should advance the funds necessary for the army—would have gone near to provoking a civil war. To disband the army at a

<sup>1</sup> Bonet's Correspondence, August 27-September 7, and September 10-21, 1703, Von Noorden, i., 518.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*, September 24-October 5, 1703, *ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> "I have spoke with the person mentioned . . . who says that when he was in Scotland he saw the gentlemen of the country disciplining their men, and that the people were generally armed; that they drank the Prince of Wales's health, and seemed exasperated against England." Duke of Ormonde to Secretary Sir C. Hedg es, Dublin, February 11, 1705, *Ormonde MSS.*, p. 777.



moment when a hostile movement, as the queen's message had reminded parliament, was expected from France, was out of the question. It was agreed therefore that the Scots ministry should unanimously represent the dangerous condition of affairs to the queen, and recommend her to pass the Act of Security. The moment at which this advice was laid before the disgusted queen<sup>1</sup> was critical in the history of England. It was the end of July, 1704. Marlborough was marching to the Danube, and the existence of the English ministry hung upon his success. His defeat would in all probability be followed by a French invasion of Scotland, and such was the suspicion felt against England across the border that the Scots might decline the aid of English troops to preserve them from the pretender. No resort seemed to be left but to deal with the more immediate danger, to preserve the union of the kingdoms during the queen's life, even at the cost of sacrificing it after her death. On August 6-17, a few days before the news of Blenheim reached England, Godolphin advised the queen to pass the Act of Security. Scarcely was the ink dry on the parchment when a revulsion of feeling set in. The news of Blenheim transformed the English political horizon. A country which had shattered France had nothing to fear from Scotland. The surrender of Godolphin, but a few days before unavoidable, now appeared a gratuitous humiliation. The English parliament met on October 29, O.S., and Lord Haversham, a political stormy petrel, brought on a debate in the house of lords upon Scottish affairs.

The time had arrived for the whigs to decide whether they would continue Godolphin in office, or withdraw their support and watch his downfall. There were comings and goings between the whig leaders and the lord treasurer. The intermediary was Lord Monthermer, afterwards Marlborough's son-in-law, and in 1709 Duke of Montagu. Meanwhile a full-dress debate was fixed for November 29. The queen, anxious to retain Godolphin, now began the practice of attending debates upon important occasions, hoping that her presence might mitigate the severity of the attacks upon him. The opposition was led by Nottingham and Rochester. On the other side, Somers

<sup>1</sup> A "downright submission," in her opinion, to the cavaliers and Jacobites. *Seafeld MSS.*, pp. 203-4, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 14th Rep., App., iii.

CHAP. V. urged counsels of moderation. No good could arise out of criticisms of the acts of the Scots parliament, over which the parliament of England could pretend to no sort of jurisdiction. Such proceedings would be futile sources of irritation. It was a wiser course for England to demonstrate that if it came to a war of retaliations, the Scots would be "the greatest losers by it". That the burning desire of Scotland was admission to free trade with England and her colonies every one knew. The diversions suggested by Somers would set the Scottish instinct for trade against the Scottish instinct for punctilio. A series of resolutions was passed by the lords on December 11, of which the first was once more to empower the crown to nominate commissioners to treat for a union. In the meanwhile, Scotsmen should not enjoy the privileges of Englishmen unless naturalised and permanently resident, or in the sea or land service, "until a union be had or the succession settled as in England". The importation of cattle from Scotland should be prohibited, and the exportation to Scotland of English wool, the raw material of its manufactures. The admiralty were to be instructed to provide cruisers to suppress the trade still surreptitiously carried on between Scotland and France. In short, Scotland, in default of union, should be treated on the footing she had assumed for herself, that of an independent and rival nation.

The Tories were not slow to excite their own imaginations and those of their constituents with apprehensions of a Scottish invasion.<sup>1</sup> As a concession to popular feeling the house of lords voted to address the queen praying for repairs to the fortifications of Newcastle, Carlisle, and Hull, for the raising of the militia of the four northern counties, for the maintenance of "a competent number" of regular troops in the north of England and of Ireland, and for the disarming of papists. Bills were draughted by the judges in conformity with the lords' resolutions. The first, for an entire union, was read a third time on December 20 and sent down to the commons. When, however, a bill followed incorporating the other resolutions and inflicting penalties on default, the commons conceived their privilege of exclusively originating money bills to

<sup>1</sup> See a letter from Edward Repington to Thomas Coke, M.P., December 1, 1704, in *Coke MSS.*, cf. *Cowper MSS.*, iii., 53.

be assailed. But public opinion would not tolerate a state of suspense which would have been involved in an irreconcilable attitude towards the ministry. Marlborough had returned to England on the 14th-25th, the popular idol. London exulted in the spectacle of a procession bearing from the Tower to Westminster Hall the trophies of victory on January 3, 1705. Three days later another pageant accompanied the duke to his entertainment by the city of London at the Goldsmiths' Hall. It was not a moment to choose for trying a fall with Godolphin with the nation's hero at his back. All that the commons could do was to accept the lords' bills in substance, though, to save their face, they formally redrafted them. They were then sent up to the lords in the form of one original bill. One addition of importance was made. It was resolved to shew Scotland that the more compliant disposition of the Irish legislature was reaping its reward. A clause was inserted prohibiting the importation of Scotch linen into England and Ireland. At the same time an act was passed opening the West Indies to Irish linen carried in English bottoms. All Scotsmen should be reputed as aliens unless the succession of the crown of Scotland followed the English precedent.<sup>1</sup>

CHAP.  
V.

These retaliatory measures added to the bitterness already manifested in Scotland. By the nomination of the Marquis of Tweeddale, the leader of the "flying squadron," as high commissioner in 1704, it had been hoped that a middle party would be formed of sufficient strength to carry the settlement of the succession, which the queen at this time had strongly at heart.<sup>2</sup> The politics of dilettantism yield in stress to the politics of resolution, and the new "queen's servants" in Scotland only contrived to remain on amicable terms with the opposition by the concession of the Act of Security. It had become even more evident in Scotland, where the pretender's friends were numerous, than in England, that the cause of the protestant succession must be entrusted to the party to whose existence it was vital, to the presbyterians in religion and the whigs in politics. At the head of this party, the most representative of the nation,

<sup>1</sup>3 & 4 Anne, c. 7.

<sup>2</sup>See her instructions to the Earl of Seafield, the Scots chancellor, April 5, 1704, *Seafield MSS.*, p. 194.

CHAP. stood John Campbell, second Duke of Argyll. He was but  
V. twenty-seven years of age ; but his territorial influence, his wealth, and the eminent services of his family to the whig cause marked him out as its natural leader. He was nominated, in place of Lord Tweeddale, the queen's commissioner for 1705. The Duke of Queensberry, as an astute manager of the place hunters and pensioners to whom the favours of the court were the goal of a political career, regained office as lord privy seal.

Early in the year 1705 an unfortunate incident irritated public feeling in both Scotland and England. In retaliation for the seizure, at the instance of the London East India Company, of a Scottish interloper in the Thames, the Scottish African and East Indian Company arrested an English vessel called the *Worcester*, which had been driven into the Firth of Forth, and tried the captain and crew for piracy and murder. By English procedure the prosecution would have failed to prove their case, there being no sufficient evidence of the identity of the vessel upon which the piracy was alleged to have been committed, nor that the captain was really murdered. Nevertheless on March 14, the captain and fourteen of the crew were condemned to death and the sentence was applauded in Scotland with passionate enthusiasm. The guilt or innocence of Captain Green became an international question. The ministers in London transmitted to Scotland affidavits showing his innocence, and that the captain, Drummond, supposed to have been murdered by him, was alive in Madagascar.<sup>1</sup> The Scottish ministry replied that "there was no possibility of preserving the public peace without allowing some that were thought most guilty to be executed".<sup>2</sup> Three victims were selected to gratify the national thirst for blood, and died protesting their innocence, which was confirmed more than twenty years later.

On February 27, O.S., 1706, the Scots commissioners were appointed for the treaty of the union. The selections were made with a wise discrimination. Mere irreconcilables, like Lord Belhaven and Fletcher of Saltoun, were excluded ; otherwise the fractions of the Scottish parliament were all represented. Even Lockhart of Carnwath, a Jacobite, was included.

<sup>1</sup> *Seafeld MSS.*, p. 196.

<sup>2</sup> Chancellor Seafeld to Godolphin, April 11, 1705, Burton's *Queen Ann*, i., 324, n.

Of the thirty-one commissioners seventeen were commoners, some of them small landowners, others officials in the departments of law or finance. Most of the peers held office. The thirty-one English nominations were made by Godolphin and Harley, who were themselves of the number. They consisted largely of whig aristocrats, the two archbishops, Cowper, the new lord keeper, the two chief justices, John Smith, the new speaker, and the law officers. The commissioners sat for the first time on April 16 in the council chamber at the Cockpit, near Whitehall.

CHAP.  
V.

The first proposal came from the Scots. It was for a union of a federal nature, in which Scotland, while enjoying the advantages reserved for English subjects, should retain its own parliament. But from the outset the English commissioners were firm that a union meant a union of parliaments. Without that, admission to England's colonial trade, the bait which whetted Scotch appetites, was out of the question. Declining to consider the Scots' proposal, they submitted a counter-proposal for a union of kingdoms and parliaments under the crown as limited by the English Act of Succession. This the Scots accepted with a proviso for their free admission to English trade at home and in the colonies. The constitutional principle having been agreed upon, subsequent proceedings resolved themselves into estimates of the financial consequences to Scotland. Hitherto the burden of expenditure had fallen upon England. Its debt exceeded £17,700,000, while that of Scotland was £160,000. The proportions of revenue raised by taxation were ludicrously unequal, the landowners of England, for example, paying £2,000,000 land tax, while those of Scotland paid but £3,600 yearly. If Scotland were to take a share of the English debt, what compensation should she have? If she should come under the burden of English taxation, what proportion should she bear? Upon all these matters the English commissioners exercised a wise generosity. In the matter of taxation they conceded abatements and remissions. As compensation for the liabilities undertaken they fixed a sum called "the equivalent" of £398,085 to be paid by England at the union. It was agreed that this should be applied towards providing Scotland with a new coinage, paying up in full the shareholders of the bankrupt Scotch African Company,

CHAP. V. thereafter to be dissolved, and encouraging manufactures and fisheries. In adjusting the representation the English commissioners showed the same liberality. While bearing but a fortieth part of the common burden, Scotland was offered an eleventh part of the legislative representation, regard being had to her proportion of the total population of the two kingdoms. Sixteen peers and forty-five commoners were to sit for Scotland in the common parliament. Her system of law and her ecclesiastical establishment were to remain unchanged. On July 22, 1706, twenty-seven English and twenty-six Scotch commissioners signed the articles.

Upon the eve of the last meeting of the Scots parliament in the autumn of 1706 the government reckoned to have won the majority both of the elected and hereditary members. The "flying squadron" had relaxed its nationalist sympathies. The campaign of 1706, which had dispelled any hope of a French invasion, had tended to make some of the Jacobites reconcilable. In response to addresses to the queen from the Scots parliament against any progress in the treaty of union till the act declaring them aliens was repealed, the English parliament had cheerfully repealed not only that but all clauses hostile to Scotch trade "to the end that the good and friendly disposition of this kingdom towards the kingdom of Scotland may appear".<sup>1</sup> But there were signs of strong popular hostility to a union. In the wealthy south-eastern counties, the home of presbyterianism and whiggery, the impulse felt by those who were on the path of economic progress was towards England. But here Edinburgh anticipated with dislike its degradation from a capital to a provincial city. On the east coast up to Aberdeen the strong Anglo-Saxon element was also on the whole friendly. It was otherwise on the west. The western counties of the lowlands and the hill country of mid-Scotland on that side were strongholds of the covenanters. Children of men who had endured under Lauderdale and Dundee, they hated prelacy with a zeal equal to that with which they hated papacy. Those who, in a commission on which sat Anglican prelates, trucked the independence of Scotland and the purity of its gospel were to be withstood as associates of the priests of Baal were with-

<sup>1</sup> 4 Anne, c. 3.

stood by the heroes of Bible history. In the western highlands, where many were still Roman catholics, the clans remembered with bitterness the sword of William of Orange. With not a few notable exceptions both chiefs and followers were ready to support the pretender in arms. "There came a scheme from Scotland," wrote in 1705 the Scotch spy employed in Paris, "to the Court of St. Germain's, telling them that on the conclusion of the union was a proper time for the King of France to send in some troops with some money and ammunition and some arms and some officers; and if the Prince of Wales would come himself, the most of the kingdom would join him withal."<sup>1</sup> The Jacobites deceived themselves. Zealous as the fanatics of the covenant were against the union, they were yet more zealous against the Stewarts, the slaughterers of the saints.

CHAP.  
V.

Of all Scottish parliamentarians the Duke of Queensberry was incontestably the most capable. In his *History of the Union* Daniel De Foe, a competent critic, who was entrusted by Harley with the task of watching the progress of the measure,<sup>2</sup> has left an eloquent record of his talents as a manager. He enjoyed the confidence of the presbyterians.<sup>3</sup> Queensberry's ablest lieutenant was John Dalrymple, first Earl of Stair, a name stained with the memory of the massacre of Glencoe, but to whose brilliant parts even the vindictive Jacobite, Lockhart of Carnwath, bears testimony. As secretary of state, John Erskine, the young Earl of Mar, a recruit from the cavalier party, was skilful at unravelling the intrigues of his late associates. The Estates of Scotland met for their last session on October 3, with Queensberry as high commissioner. At once parliament was flooded with addresses against union. Edinburgh was in daily uproar. Mobs, crying "No union," "No union," "English dogs!" and the like, paraded the streets. The Duke of Hamilton, the leader of the opposition, was attended in his chair by shouting crowds. Soldiers were called

<sup>1</sup> Memorandum on Scotch affairs by Captain John Ogilvie, *Portland MSS.*, iv., 276.

<sup>2</sup> A memorandum of his duties on this mission, which was secret, is given in a letter to Harley, of September 13, 1706, in *Portland MSS.*, iv., 326-28, 334.

<sup>3</sup> Lord Yester to [the Earl of Oxford], August 28, 1711, *Portland MSS.*, v., 76.

CHAP. in to disperse the rioters.<sup>1</sup> When, conformably with Scottish  
V. usage, the debate on the general question began on November 2-13, an eloquent declamation was uttered by John Hamilton, Lord Belhaven, the principal orator of the opposition, which was received with so much admiration by the public that it found a place in every Scotsman's library. Declamation seldom alters parliamentary votes; and the speech was replied to by the Earl of Marchmont, a leader of the "squadron," in terms of contemptuous sarcasm. By a majority of sixty-four the house decided to proceed to the terms of the treaty of union.

In order to pacify religious apprehensions, the government at an early stage interposed a bill elaborated by the general assembly for the security of the Scots kirk. Upon this Lord Belhaven raised a substantial difficulty. No equality, he argued, was conceded by a union which allowed Englishmen to hold offices in Scotland without a sacramental test, but imposed one on Scotsmen admitted to office in England. That the clause proposing the exemption of Scotsmen from the test should have been rejected by thirty-nine votes was due to the support given to the government by the episcopals and the Jacobites. It perhaps also indicates that the expectation of seeing Scotsmen in office in England was so remote that the grievance was regarded as fanciful. The act for the security of the Scots kirk was passed on the 12th, with a proviso for its repetition in any act adopting the treaty of union. It is in accordance with the provisions of this act that the sovereign takes an oath immediately on his accession to maintain the Scottish establishment. "From this day forwards," wrote Stair to Harley, on November 12, "the ferment will abate."<sup>2</sup> Upon a resumption of the consideration of the articles of union, the second, so hateful to the Jacobites, providing for the succession according to the English precedent, was carried by fifty-nine votes. Upon the third article, that both kingdoms should be represented by

<sup>1</sup> De Foe to Harley, *Portland MSS.*, iv., 339-41, 342-34.

<sup>2</sup> *Portland MSS.*, iv., 348. Godolphin treated the turmoil with a discerning contempt. "They are the first people that ever I knew in a fixed intention of going into an open rebellion who thought fit to make so public a declaration of it beforehand." *Brit. Mus., Add. MS.*, 6420.



one parliament, there was a formidable resistance upon constitutional grounds. Hobbes, Filmer, and Locke had familiarised men's minds with theories of social contracts and of consequences deducible from them. It was urged by the opposition that to agree to the destruction of the Scots parliament, and thereby of the independence of the kingdom, was to usurp a competence never created by the constituencies, nor in the power of the constituencies to create, and that the consent, at least, of every person entitled to be represented was a condition precedent. The government knew that the interval following a dissolution of parliament would be employed, not in political argument, but in preparation for armed violence. Colonel Erskine, provost of Stirling, in front of his regiment of militia "with his sword drawn in one hand and his pen in the other signed" an address against union "and made the rest do so also".<sup>1</sup> Edinburgh was full of highlanders armed to the teeth.<sup>2</sup> "All the west is full of tumult. Glasgow is mad," wrote De Foe.<sup>3</sup> But for the weather, its people boasted, 15,000 of them would have been at Edinburgh.<sup>4</sup> As soon as they began to carry out their threat, the parliament repealed the Act of Security and made appearing in arms illegal.<sup>5</sup> It was the only resource left, for the Scotch troops numbered but 2,000 men and these were "not to be depended upon".<sup>6</sup> Stair recommended that troops should be held in readiness in the north of England and in Ireland.<sup>7</sup> "All the interest here would never carry the union without blood."<sup>8</sup>

Despite these gloomy forebodings, the opposition in parliament dissolved with unexpected rapidity. Between the Dukes of Hamilton and Atholl there had long been rivalry. Each had outvied the other in zeal against the union. Hamilton, however, had been steadily losing influence. Not he, but Atholl, had been regarded in the affair of the Scottish plot as the representative of the Jacobites. While Atholl now

<sup>1</sup> De Foe to Harley, Edinburgh, November 23, 1706, *Portland MSS.*, iv., 356.

<sup>2</sup> De Foe to Harley, Edinburgh, November 13, *ibid.*, p. 349.

<sup>3</sup> De Foe to Harley, Edinburgh, November 19, *ibid.*, p. 352.

<sup>4</sup> De Foe to Harley, November 16, *ibid.*, p. 351; December 27, *ibid.*, p. 374.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, <sup>6</sup> De Foe to Harley, Edinburgh, November 13, 1706, *ibid.*, p. 350.

<sup>7</sup> Earl of Stair to Harley, Edinburgh, November 26, 1706, *ibid.*, p. 359.

<sup>8</sup> De Foe to Harley, Edinburgh, November 20, 1706, *ibid.*, p. 361.

CHAP. V. ranged himself with the party of violence, Hamilton dissuaded from action, and the dowager-duchess threatened to evict any of her tenants who appeared in arms.<sup>1</sup> A correspondent of Harley, writing from Edinburgh, reported secret visits paid by Hamilton to the chancellor, Lord Scafield, and the Duke of Queensberry.<sup>2</sup> The fruit of these interviews was soon culled. The articles conceding freedom of trade to Scotland and settling the respective quotas of taxation, etc., were passed without serious resistance. The opposition was divided, and Hamilton was the leader of a body in favour of passing an act of succession and rejecting a union. Atholl and the Jacobites were resolute against settling the crown on the house of Hanover.<sup>3</sup> When the final vote upon the question of union was put, Hamilton, to the amazement of his followers, remained motionless in his place, and the government by forty votes carried in the face of a furious but disconcerted opposition the representation agreed on by the commissioners for the union. The union was now assured, but it cost the life of one of its most ardent supporters. Lord Stair "made an extraordinary speech on the debate on the twenty-second article and was found dead in his bed in the morning" (January 8).<sup>4</sup> Excitement and exhaustion killed him. The treaty received the touch of the sceptre on January 16, 1707.

On the 28th, the queen in person presented the Scots ratification of the treaty for union to the two houses. As in Scotland, ministers judged it wise to begin by disarming ecclesiastical antipathies. The primate Tenison, on February 3, laid before the house of lords a clause, framed upon the model of the parallel in the Scots Act, for securing the position of the Church of England. The Scotch presbyterians had acted with magnanimity. They had imposed no tests. Episcopalians north of the Tweed were, equally with presbyterians, admissible to office. It would have been well if the English bishops could have followed their example. Certainly if Tenison, who was bold enough to eulogise the Scotch establishment, did not venture to take this course, it was not for

<sup>1</sup> De Foe to Harley, Edinburgh, December 7, 1706, *Portland MSS.*, iv., 364.

<sup>2</sup> D. Fearns to Harley, *ibid.*, p. 347.

<sup>3</sup> De Foe to Harley, January 4, 1706-7, *ibid.*, p. 378.

<sup>4</sup> De Foe to Harley, January 9, 1706-7, *ibid.*, p. 380.

want of tolerance but because the prospects of such a proposal were hopeless. The bill introduced by the primate, which was afterwards incorporated in the Act of Union, provided for the perpetuation of the Act of Uniformity and all other laws "for the establishment and preservation of the Church of England and the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government thereof".

In both houses the proceedings upon the union were the same. The most substantial objections went upon finance and representation. Throughout the divisions in both houses the government had ample majorities. Ministers had resolved to carry the bill substantially as it left the Scots parliament, for amendments would involve endless wrangles and final discomfiture. The knowledge of this fact and the popular feeling in favour of union knocked the heart out of the opposition. The bill was carried in the commons by 274 to 116 votes on February 28, 1706-7. Taken up to the lords on March 1 it passed rapidly through their house. A final protest was signed on the 4th by Nottingham, and seven tory peers of little note. On the 6th, the queen attended the house in person and the bill for a union of the two kingdoms of England and Scotland received the royal assent.<sup>1</sup>

The interval of nearly two months before May 1, 1707, when the union was to take effect, furnished occasion for the first quarrel between the two nations. Scottish merchants took advantage of the lower range of customs duties in Scotland to accumulate foreign imports in order to pour them into England. For this purpose vessels were freighted in Holland and even in France. On the other hand, English merchants who had paid an import duty of sixpence a pound on imported tobacco obtained a drawback of fivepence on exporting it to Scotland with a view to a subsequent reimportation free of duty across the border. Those of the commercial classes who could make a profit out of neither operation were exasperated. The English customs officers in June seized the cargoes of a fleet of forty sail, "mostly loaded with wine and brandy," carried from Scotland to the Thames. Only the prudence of Godolphin in waiving the rights of the crown averted a dan-

<sup>1</sup> 5 Anne, c. 8.

CHAP.  
V.

gerous collision. Eager to catch at grievances, the Scottish malcontents next clamoured at the delay in the payment of "the equivalent". Even as early as June 5 a supporter of the union writes that the want of "the equivalent" was contributing with the intrigues of the Jacobites to render the union a failure.<sup>1</sup> On July 8 twelve waggons were dispatched to Edinburgh with £100,000 in bullion, under convoy of a troop of horse. The procession was greeted in the High Street with shouts of "Judas money". When it was found that the residue was offered in exchequer bills there was a fresh outburst against English perfidy. Public confidence was only restored through the acceptance of the bills by some large shareholders of the African Company. The distribution of the money involved bitter wrangles and recriminations between the commissioners of union, to whom it was entrusted, and the public, and among the commissioners themselves, for whose indemnification large sums were appropriated.<sup>2</sup> Nearly twenty years passed before any portion was allotted for the encouragement of the fisheries or manufactures. The introduction of the English system of raising internal revenue excited fresh dissatisfaction. English highwaymen, it was said, in anticipation of Swift's sarcasm on Irish bishops, migrated to Scotland as excise officers. They were pelted in the streets and compelled to walk for protection with the town officials.<sup>3</sup> The increase of duties at the ports gave a stimulus to smuggling, and the customs officers and riding surveyors of the coast were driven to fulfil their functions under military escort. The fruits of the union in the eyes of the masses were increased cost of living and the influx of a horde of objectionable English officials.

<sup>1</sup> Lord Anstruther to the Duke of Montrose, *Montrose MSS.*, p. 368, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 3rd Rep., App.

<sup>2</sup> Burnet; *Seafeld MSS.*, p. 222, John Earl of Mar, Secretary of State for Scotland, to James Earl of Seafeld, Lord Chancellor.

<sup>3</sup> Earl of Glasgow to Duke of Montrose, June 3, 1707, *Montrose MSS.*, p. 376.

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE CAMPAIGNS OF 1707-1708.

WITH the crushing defeat of the French before Turin by Eugene on September 7, the supremacy of Austria in Northern Italy was assured, and this involved a revival of the territorial disputes between the emperor and the Duke of Savoy. The emperor, in order to get possession of Mantua without a conflict, presently ventured on a grave perfidy. Without the knowledge of the allies, he entered into a treaty with France on March 13, 1707, known as the treaty of Milan, allowing the return home of the isolated French garrisons in Italy. His own troops, now set free, he destined, notwithstanding the protest of the allies, for the conquest of Naples. CHAP.  
VI.

With the capture of Madrid in June, 1706, the hopes of the allies rose high. The French, on their side, made extraordinary exertions to reinforce their troops. After the release of their garrisons from Italy by the treaty of Milan, they transferred a strong force to Roussillon for operations against Catalonia from the north. Philip, Duke of Orleans, was appointed to supersede Berwick in the chief command. On February 7, 1707, the belated expeditionary force under Lord Rivers arrived at Alicante. Originally numbering 10,000 men, it had already been reduced through sickness and privation by a fourth. The arrival of Rivers added fresh flames to the heartburnings which during the winter had raged at Valencia. On the one side was Galway, supported by General Stanhope, the English envoy-extraordinary to Charles, on the other the Dutch general, Noyelles, Liechtenstein, the archduke's principal Austrian adviser, and Cardona, the Spanish viceroy of Catalonia. The two English generals were for adopting the advice of Marlborough, who could scarcely have been

CHAP. VI. accurately informed of the state of the country, and for marching at once on Madrid in concert with an advance expected from Portugal. The others were for a defensive war maintained by garrisons dispersed through Valencia and Catalonia. To these last Rivers and Peterborough, who had returned from Genoa on January 6, allied themselves. From divided counsels came divided action. In the middle of March Charles, accompanied by his ministers and escorted by Noyelles with the Spanish and 800 Dutch troops, left Valencia and returned to Barcelona. A partial dispersion of the army among neighbouring garrisons took place. Galway's forces were now reduced by some 10,000 men. Two compensations fell to him; the peremptory recall of Peterborough by Sunderland on the archduke's complaints, and the resignation of his command by Rivers, who also returned home.

Galway's plan was to march through the hilly country of the south of Aragon, where Berwick's superiority in cavalry would be rendered ineffective, and throw himself into Madrid. He began his march on April 10, at the head of about 15,500 men, half of them Portuguese, the rest including 4,800 English, besides Dutch, Germans, and Huguenots, but no Spaniards. On April 24 news was brought to the camp of the allies, who were besieging the small fortress of Villena, that Berwick was advancing, presumably to its relief. At a council of war the allied generals unanimously agreed to take the aggressive, before Orleans, who was on the march, could effect a junction with Berwick. Berwick was in command of 25,400 men with a good train of artillery. Of these troops, 11,900 were French and the remainder Spanish. On the 25th, apprised of the approach of the allies, Berwick, who had reached Almanza, had distributed his forces in two lines, with the town at their rear. His cavalry were at the wings. Between his army and that of the allies lay the plain of Almanza, swept by the fire of his artillery. Galway adopted a similar disposition of his men. The attack began with a charge by General Carpenter's cavalry upon the Spanish horse posted at Berwick's right wing. This was followed up by the advance of the English, Dutch, and Huguenot foot, who drove the enemy's infantry towards the walls of the town. But a charge of the French cavalry of Berwick's left wing against the Portuguese horse threw them

into a panic and exposed the victorious foot to being cut to pieces by an attack on their right flank. Galway having been temporarily deprived of sight by two sabre cuts over his right eye, there was no one to give general directions, and each section of the army fought independently. Under cover of a charge by Carpenter at the head of the Huguenot dragoons, Galway drew off the left, over which he had command, numbering 3,500 men. After a retreat of eight miles, the fragments of the centre were compelled next day to lay down their arms. The total loss to the allies was 4,000 killed and wounded and 3,000 prisoners. "I cannot," wrote Galway to Sunderland, "but look upon the affairs of Spain as lost by this bad disaster."

The news of Almanza revived in the minds of Godolphin and Marlborough the policy of a diversion in the south of France. It was still the belief in England that without French troops Philip would be unable to maintain himself on the Spanish throne. Reluctantly yielding to the importunities of the English ministry, Prince Eugene consented to serve in an expedition against Toulon. At the beginning of July the Duke of Savoy and Eugene took the field at the head of 35,000 men. A fleet under Shovell was ready to co-operate. The army arrived before Toulon on the 26th. But the invaders were, as the letters of the English envoy, Chetwynd, disclose, in no condition for a successful campaign. Their march had been through a country bare of provisions, amid a hostile population. Discipline had given way before privations. Desertion was rampant. Nor was it easy to compensate for the ineffectiveness of the land forces by the operations of the fleet. A gauntlet of forts would have to be run before, with its limited range, the fleet could bombard the town, while the space between the fleet and the army was commanded by French fortified posts. Between the allies and the town walls lay Tissé in an intrenched camp, daily receiving reinforcements. It speedily became apparent that the army was inadequate to the task of investing Toulon, perhaps even of defending itself. Time was needed for the siege and time was working on behalf of the enemy. On the 22nd the allies turned their backs upon Toulon. The disorderly retreat was impeded by a revengeful peasantry, but unmolested

CHAP. VI. by the French army. The failure of the siege was, however, partly redeemed by the success of the operations of the fleet. Fearful lest they should fall into Shovell's hands, the French themselves destroyed ten of their line of battle ships. The French Mediterranean fleet ceased to exist. This was Shovell's last service.\* On his way home he was wrecked off the Scilly Isles and murdered for his jewelry. In him England lost a naval officer whose courage and enterprise found no equal in the next generation of her seamen.

Early in the year the English ministry had renewed its endeavours to strengthen the Grand Alliance in Italy. The republic of Venice was, however, indisposed to risk a war with France in the Adriatic or the Mediterranean,<sup>1</sup> while that of Genoa, suspicious of the Duke of Savoy, and with nothing to hope from the emperor, was emboldened by the failure at Toulon to turn a deaf ear to the allies. As the misfortune of Toulon affected the disposition of the Italian powers, so Almanza was the cause of a revulsion of feeling in Portugal. The Portuguese complained that their troops had been marched across Spain, and had left their own frontiers without protection. On December 29, Methuen wrote that Portugal could offer no resistance to a French invasion. Between the spirit which prevailed at the court of Lisbon and that at the court of Barcelona there was not much to choose. Galway alone displayed resolution, energetically reforming his army the morrow after Almanza. The Austrian party was torn by dissension and busy with recrimination. Charles himself had lost his hold on the Catalans, who were disgusted with the haughtiness of his German favourites. Nevertheless, they remained animated by their hatred of the Castilians, and reliant upon the difficulties presented by their country to an invading army. At the end of 1707, when the Bourbon army withdrew to winter quarters, Charles still held the fortresses of Tortosa and Gerona besides Barcelona. In the following spring reinforcements from the maritime powers might restore his fortunes.

In the autumn of 1706 the giant form of Charles XII. of

<sup>1</sup> See the letter of Stepney to Hedges relating a discussion of Venetian policy between himself and the Venetian ambassador at Vienna, October 16-27, 1703. *Buckleuch MSS.*, ii., 2, 685-87.



Sweden was casting its shadow across the path of the Grand Alliance. By a treaty agreed upon at Alt-Ranstädt, near Leipzig, Frederick Augustus, Elector of Saxony, was compelled to renounce the throne of Poland in favour of Stanislaus, the candidate supported by Charles. In his camp at Alt-Ranstädt, the Swede was the arbiter of Europe. At the head of a disciplined army approaching the number of 60,000 men he had it in his power to turn the scale of fortune as he pleased. Charles conceived himself the successor of Gustavus Adolphus as "the bulwark of the Protestant faith" in Europe. To him Louis XIV. represented a persecuting Catholicism to which he would lend no assistance either by mediation or arms. But against the Emperor Joseph I. he had an accumulation of complaints. Of these the most important were the persecution of Protestants in Silesia and the refusal to surrender 1,200 Russian prisoners who had taken refuge on Austrian territory. Flushed with victory, and confident in the belief that he was entrusted with a divine mission, Charles was already, in the early spring of 1707, threatening to exact redress by force. A march of the Swedes upon Vienna must have been the ruin of the Grand Alliance.

Dr. John Robinson, the English envoy to Sweden, having failed to pacify Charles's exasperation, the maritime powers agreed, at Marlborough's instance, that the crisis was one demanding his diplomacy. On April 20, N.S., 1707, he left the Hague, arriving at the camp of Alt-Ranstädt six days later. Admitted to the presence of Charles, he addressed the king in a speech of adulation pitched to the tone of his intoxicated military vanity. The king through Count Piper, his minister for foreign affairs, returned an answer unusually gracious, professing the utmost regard for the queen and for the interests of the Grand Alliance. He assured Marlborough that he would undertake no mediation unless with the queen's concurrence. Marlborough left Charles with the conviction that his mission had proved a success, and that the court of Vienna would, on its side, follow his counsel and satisfy the Swedish demands. For months the characteristic evasiveness and procrastination of Joseph I. postponed a settlement. But for his conquest of Naples in May, 1707, and the occupation of the Italian duchies, which divided his forces, he would probably

**CHAP.** have challenged a recourse to arms. Those diversions, which  
**VI.** had angered the maritime powers, thus proved the salvation of the Alliance. When the patience of Charles at length gave way, the emperor yielded, and the Swedish army turned its steps towards the Russian frontier.

In January, 1707, Louis, Margrave of Baden, whose inactivity and contentiousness had long been a thorn in the side of Marlborough, died. The commander whose co-operation in Germany the duke would have preferred was Prince Eugene, but Eugene was already destined for the expedition against Toulon. The imperial general in Germany chosen, in conformity with Austrian traditions, on account of his age and rank, was Christian, Margrave of Baireuth, as infirm and even less enterprising than his predecessor. On the night of May 22 he allowed himself to be surprised by Villars within the fortified lines of Stollhofen, fled eastwards, and again opened up to the French the prospect of a march upon Vienna in concert with the Hungarian insurgents. Exasperated by the excesses of the French in Würtemberg, the South German princes turned for aid to the maritime powers. Marlborough, who was at this time confronting the army of Vendôme, seized the opportunity to strike a bargain which at once served to get rid of the margrave and to fortify his own influence with the whig party. The maritime powers would send a detachment to threaten the communications of Villars on condition that the emperor would nominate the Elector of Hanover to the command of the army of the Rhine. The negotiations were protracted from May to September, when the Elector George took over the command of the imperial forces. Week after week passed uneventfully, and at the beginning of November Villars withdrew to the left bank of the Rhine. Marlborough, in his intrenched camp at Meldert, was playing a game of diplomacy rather than of war, his gaze directed to Alt-Ranstädt and Vienna, where a new conflagration might at any moment arise. Not until August, when the Swedish war-cloud was driving towards Russia, did he feel free to move. But the autumn proved wet, the army was wasted by sickness, and the French, as Marlborough bitterly complained, had been reinforced by their garrisons from Italy and by their victorious comrades from Toulon. There, as in Germany and Spain,

the sun of success had shone upon the Bourbon arms. For the allies the campaign of 1707 had proved a gloomy contrast to the brilliancy of the year of Ramillies. CHAP.  
VI.

Dispiriting as the campaign had proved to be, Marlborough and Godolphin remained resolute for the continuance of the war. But both English and Dutch agreed in indignation at the selfish policy of the emperor, for the benefit of whose family the war was being carried on, at his greed for territory, and at his neglect to perform his pledges as to troops. The German princes were full of grievances and demands. Chief among them the Elector George of Hanover, jealous of Eugene, was threatening rather to resign his command than to suffer a partial eclipse by a comradeship in arms. It needed all the diplomatic skill of Marlborough and Eugene, who visited Hanover together in April, 1708, to soothe his injured vanity. He consented to retain his command on the Rhine with the understanding that his independence would be assured by the formation of a third army on the Moselle under Eugene. The three armies should co-operate together in a general offensive, the elector with 45,000 men against Alsace, Eugene, at the head of 40,000 imperialists on the Moselle, and Marlborough in the Spanish Netherlands. A secret understanding between Eugene and Marlborough provided that, in case of need, either should support the other with his entire force. The French army in Flanders was placed under the nominal command of the Duke of Burgundy, the eldest son of the dauphin. At his side was Vendôme; but between the pupil of the saintly Fénelon and Vendôme, a man notorious for his coarseness and profanity, there existed an incompatibility of temper paralysing the loyal concert indispensable to the success of a divided command.

By the middle of May, the French army was in the field. Its two commanders were involved in incessant wrangles, while Marlborough in his intrenched camp at Terbank, west of Louvain, waited until the movements of Eugene upon the Moselle should compel the French to withdraw reinforcements thither. As usual, the imperialists were unready. Impatient at the prospect of an inglorious campaign, Marlborough at length on May 30, N.S., wrote to Eugene recommending a change of plan. A sudden junction of their armies by a

CHAP. VI. series of forced marches would enable them to throw themselves in superior numbers upon the troops of Vendôme and Burgundy. A month later Eugene began his march, but at this critical moment an important diversion occurred in favour of the French. The growing discontent aroused in the Netherlands by the oppressive government of the Dutch had taken shape in a conspiracy to replace the great towns in French hands. Ghent and Bruges welcomed French troops; Ostend was in danger. In a few days much of the fruit of Ramillies was lost. On July 6, Eugene with his staff joined Marlborough at the camp of Anderlecht, west of Brussels. To the French army, with its superiority of numbers, time was precious, for the imperialist reinforcements of 30,000 foot were still several days' march behind. Vendôme conceived the plan of crossing the Schelde and storming Oudenarde, the link between Flanders and Brabant. If Oudenarde was to be saved to the allies, there was no leisure to await Eugene's troops. Hastening westwards by night marches Marlborough reached its walls while the French, some eight miles to the north, were bridging the river, unaware, as at Blenheim, of his movements.

The scene of the battle of Oudenarde on July 11, 1708, may be described as an arc of which the Schelde on the east forms the chord, the arc extending about two miles westwards. The area of ground rising upwards from the Schelde thus inclosed is bisected by the little river Norken, running from west to east into the Schelde. Behind this the main body of the French was posted. From north to south the area known as the plain of Heurne is about three miles. The ground was divided by numerous hedges and ditches, and the banks of the Norken were overgrown with brushwood. It was, therefore, unfavourable to cavalry, in which arm the French were particularly strong. So surprised were the French at the appearance of the allies that they had no time to select their positions. They had not even decided whether they would accept battle. Profiting by their indecision, Marlborough, without waiting for his whole army to cross the Schelde,<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> According to Francis Hare, the duke's chaplain and friend, "We had scarce a third part (of the foot) over" when Cadogan's attack began. Francis Hare to George Naylor, July 12, 1708, *Hare MSS.*, p. 218, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 14th Rep., App., ix.

threw forward General Cadogan, who opened a sudden attack on a body of horse and foot which had advanced to Eyne, a village two miles to the north of Oudenarde. A sharp struggle took place; the French were routed and most of them driven across the Norken, while three entire battalions and their general, the Duke de Biron, were taken prisoners. In this charge, the electoral prince George of Hanover, afterwards George II. of England, led a squadron with intrepidity. Cadogan's troops then pressed forward and occupied Heurne, a mile north of Eyne. It was becoming dusk and the French could still have avoided a general engagement, but the Duke of Burgundy, without consulting Vendôme, ordered an advance. After a stubbornly contested fight the issue was determined by the execution, under the direction of Marlborough, of a turning movement of the French right by the veteran Dutch marshal, Ouwerkerk. This threw the French into confusion, and soon after eight o'clock Vendôme ordered a general retreat. But for the darkness, Marlborough repeatedly affirmed, the retreat would have degenerated into a panic-stricken rout and the war have been at an end. The allies lost only 3,000 men; the French 6,000 killed and wounded and 9,000 prisoners, including 700 officers, as well as ninety-eight colours and standards. Including deserters and fugitives who never rejoined, Marlborough computed the diminution of their numbers at 20,000 men. With a modesty characteristic of his dispatches, Marlborough summed up the features of the engagement which exhibit his genius in defying with success the traditional rules of war. "We were obliged," he wrote to the queen in reply to her letter of congratulation, "not only to march five leagues that morning, but to pass a river before the enemy and to engage them before the whole army was passed." The queen ordered a public thanksgiving. The tories were divided in their attitude. To the Jacobites there were the additional vexations that the pretender, under the name of the Chevalier de St. George, had been prominent in the defeated army, and that the protestant heir had won a name for gallantry in the action.<sup>1</sup> Many of them minimised

<sup>1</sup> The interesting metrical account of the battle by John Scot, serving in the Scots Brigade in pay of the States of Holland, narrates that the Elector of Hanover, i.e. Prince George, having had his horse shot under him, was supposed

CHAP. VI. the success and affected to "look upon the giving of thanks for a victory at Oudenarde to be a mocking of God".<sup>1</sup> The first care of Vendôme after the battle was to protect Ghent and Bruges. With this object he occupied an intrenched camp behind the canal of Bruges. Here he was safe against attack and could await the advance of Berwick, whose army would raise the combined forces to 100,000 men. As after Ramillies, Marlborough proposed to strike a blow at the heart of France, to mask Lille and to advance by forced marches upon Paris. Eugene refused. It was decided, therefore, to lay siege to Lille; its relief would certainly necessitate the advance of the French armies, its capture would pave the way for Marlborough's brilliant project. In the meantime a body of English cavalry was detached to ravage Picardy.

Before the army of Berwick had entered the theatre of operations, the investment of Lille was begun on August 13. Though Vendôme and Berwick effected a junction on the 30th they could agree upon nothing but the interception of the communications of the besiegers. During September the resources of the allies were daily more straitened by the cutting off of convoys from Brussels. The only source of supplies left them was the sea. It happened that during the summer months a military force under General Erle had been cruising in the Channel, with orders to effect a landing in Normandy or Brittany. The expedition proved a failure, and the troops, at Marlborough's instance, were now conveyed to Ostend. There a large convoy was prepared, to conduct which Marlborough detached General Webb, with about 4,000 foot and three squadrons of dragoons. On September 27, when some fifteen miles from Ostend, near the castle of Wynendaele, Webb was attacked by the French general Lamothe, with troops nearly double in numbers. Reinforced, after a brilliant defence, by General Cadogan, he beat the French off. Upon the issue of this action hung the fate of Lille. "If they [Webb and Cadogan] had not succeeded, and our convoy had been lost, the consequence must have been the raising of

to have been killed, but afterwards fought on foot with a half-pike. The pretender is said by the same author to have thrice rallied the French and the Irish Brigade. *The Remembrance*, Scottish Hist. Soc. (1901), iii., 412.

<sup>1</sup> Erasmus Lewis to Robert Harley, Whitehall, August 19, 1708, *Portland MSS.*, iv., 501.

the siege next day," wrote Marlborough; "there did not remain powder and ball for above four days." "This last action," wrote Petkum, the minister of the Duke of Schleswig-Holstein at the Hague to Torcy, "is considered here more important in its consequences than the battle of Oudenarde."<sup>1</sup> Webb justly received for his exploit the thanks of the house of commons.

The progress of the besiegers could no longer be resisted. On October 22 Marshal Boufflers capitulated for the surrender of the city. The citadel held out week after week, the allies' communications were constantly interrupted, and Marlborough received the discouraging information that the enemy was expecting reinforcements. The Elector of Bavaria, who had hitherto lain inactive on the Rhine, suddenly marched to Mons, and on November 22 appeared before the gates of Brussels at the head of 15,000 men. Its inhabitants were well affected to him and its garrison numbered but 7,000 troops. Marlborough and Eugene hurried to the rescue by rapid marches, surprised and routed the French troops guarding the fords of the Schelde, and captured over 1,000 prisoners. While Eugene returned to the army of investment, Marlborough, despite the fatigue of his troops, pushed on. The defective intelligence from which the opposed commanders habitually suffered again came to his help. Scarcely was the elector aware of the passage of the Schelde ere he found Marlborough upon him. "He immediately," wrote the duke in a dispatch of November 28, "quitted the siege in the greatest confusion, leaving all his artillery and ammunition with above 800 wounded officers and soldiers in the camp, and retired towards Mons." In two days Marlborough had won two brilliant successes. Brussels was saved and the fate of Lille sealed. Marlborough stood master of Brabant. On December 9 the citadel of Lille surrendered. Ghent and Bruges speedily followed its example. The campaign of this year illustrates no less than that of 1704 the extraordinary talents of Marlborough as a general. His army was inferior to the united armies of Vendôme and Berwick, yet he contrived, after winning a pitched battle in unfavourable circumstances,

<sup>1</sup> October 4, 1708, *Round MSS.*, p. 331, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 14th Rep., App. pt. ix.

CHAP.  
VI.

to maintain the investment of a first-class fortress with its communications threatened on every side, to defeat two auxiliary armies, to harry the enemy's country, to recover the whole of the territory recently occupied by the French, and, in short, to accomplish every object to which he addressed his efforts.

In Spain at the opening of the campaign of 1708 there were three Bourbon armies afoot; one of 22,000 men, under Orleans in north-west Catalonia, a second under General Bay on the Portuguese frontier, and 6,000 Castilians under General d'Asfeldt in occupation of the province of Valencia. On the northern border of Catalonia hovered the Duke de Noailles at the head of a French force. Galway, who since his wounds at Almanza had become blind of one eye and partially deaf, was, in deference to the emperor's repeated solicitations, relieved of his thankless post as commander-in-chief of the British contingent. But so convinced were Marlborough and his whig friends of his skill as a general and his value as a diplomatist, that it was decided to nominate him to the chief command of the British forces in Portugal, and in February to accredit him as ambassador to the court of Lisbon.

While the archduke's cause continued to lose ground on the mainland, the supremacy of the maritime powers was asserting itself in his interest at sea. In August the fleet of Leake, who had succeeded Shovell in the Mediterranean, put in at Cagliari, and after a show of resistance took possession of Sardinia, replacing the Bourbon governor by the Count Cifuentes, the former leader of the Austrian party in Aragon. That island's inexhaustible granaries were now at the disposal of the allies. But the British government was not disposed to forgo all share in the advantages procured by its efforts and expenditure. The fate of Shovell had impressed more strongly than before upon the mind of Marlborough the necessity of a winter harbour in the Mediterranean. In July of this year he wrote to Stanhope: "I am so entirely convinced that nothing can be done effectually without the fleet, that I conjure you if possible to take Port Mahon". At Stanhope's instance, Leake arrived before Port Mahon, the harbour of Minorca, on September 5, and was joined by Stanhope at the head of 2,600 troops nine days later. After a little more than a fortnight's resistance St. Philip's castle, protecting the harbour, and the castle of



Fornelle were taken, the reduction of the entire island costing the allies no more than fifty men. This, the substantial part of the enterprise, was achieved by Stanhope, Leake having, in obedience to orders, returned home, leaving a squadron behind him. Port Mahon was garrisoned by British troops, and for forty-eight years Minorca remained in British hands. "England," wrote Stanhope to Sunderland, "ought never to part with this island, which will give the law to the Mediterranean both in time of war and peace."

CHAP.  
VI.

In the judgement alike of Louis XIV. and the allies, the throne of Philip V. rested upon French bayonets. A succession of disasters in the Netherlands, culminating in the loss of Lille, provoked reflexion on the part of Louis as to his power to continue his support. Victory had made the allies, on their part, inflexible in their demand that, as a basis of negotiations for peace, France should make "the preliminary" concession of Spain and the Indies, and of the Barrier.<sup>1</sup> But the prospect to the allies of playing in Spain, on behalf of Charles III., the thankless part which Louis XIV. had undertaken for his grandson, suggested to the fertile brain of the Duke of Orleans a possibility of compromise. As grandson of Anne of Austria, he professed some hereditary claim and was remote from succession to the French crown. He was ambitious and had no scruples in favour of Philip V., by whom he was disliked and distrusted. In October he opened secret negotiations with Stanhope, with whom before the war he had been on terms of friendship, proposing himself for the crown of Spain. Stanhope ventured a counter-proposal which should satisfy the ambition of Orleans for a crown and detach him from Louis XIV. The duke should have carved out for him a kingdom of Navarre and Languedoc. These negotiations were summarily cut short by the recall of the duke to France in the autumn of 1708. During the autumn and winter of 1708 the position of Philip V. had daily been growing stronger. After the evacuation in April, 1709, of the citadel of Alicante by the English garrison, which had sustained a siege of nearly five months' duration, the kingdom of Charles III. was reduced to the city of Barcelona.

<sup>1</sup> Petkum to Torcy, December 11, 1708, *Round MSS.*, p. 336.

## CHAPTER VII.

### GODOLPHIN AND HARLEY.

CHAP. GODOLPHIN in the autumn of 1706, occupied a position of  
VII. dazzling success. He was the head of an administration which had weathered violent parliamentary storms at home, which enjoyed reflected glory from the victories of Marlborough abroad, which demonstrated that English credit was sound enough to support the armies on the continent as well as the vast expense of its own expeditions, and which was about to add political stability to the constitution by the union with Scotland. Nevertheless, Godolphin was conscious that his ministry existed on sufferance. That the ministry was dependent upon the whigs had long been apparent. There were rumours of bargains by which support had been rendered in exchange for promises during the previous session. And now the whigs were pressing for fulfilment. They had not been satisfied by the preponderance accorded them in the commission for the union, nor with a few minor appointments, nor with the nomination of Cowper as lord keeper. In place of toleration they sought control. The junta must be represented in the inner circle of the queen's advisers. Of their number Halifax was a financial rival to Godolphin, Orford a naval expert, Wharton a party whip of coarse wit and notorious profligacy, and Somers was disliked by the queen as an adviser of William III. There remained Sunderland, and Sunderland was the son-in-law of Marlborough. His personality and his diplomatic experience had made an impression upon the public and upon his political associates. Born in 1674, he had imbibed the republican atmosphere of the university of Utrecht. His knowledge of foreign affairs and his acquaintance with foreign languages marked him out as

a fitting co-adjutor for Marlborough. The whigs determined to insist on his admission into the cabinet in place of Sir Charles Hedges, a tory, as secretary of state for the southern department.

CHAP.  
VII.

The native obstinacy inherited by Anne from her father was always evoked by two irritants, latitudinarianism and uncourtly independence. In the person of Sunderland both were united. He was a freethinker. He had led the opposition in the matter of the grant to Prince George. He was vehement in the expression of his opinions, and was little likely to consider either the prerogative or dignity of the queen. The queen met the proposal with passionate resistance. The Duchess of Marlborough, with characteristic impetuosity, plunged into the fray. With invocations fashionable at the period, she begged, in a letter to Anne of August, 1706, that "Mr. and Mrs. Morley (the queen and Prince George) may see their errors as to this notion before it is too late". By "notion" she meant the idea of an administration "with a part of the tories and the whigs disoblighd". The queen, however, read "nation"; her dignity was outraged and her obstinacy increased. Nor though Godolphin's explanations effected a temporary reconciliation, and the customary expressions of affection were renewed, did the influence of the duchess survive in full the estrangement provoked by this dispute. Throughout August and September matters were at a deadlock. Godolphin resolved to bring the influence of Marlborough himself to bear upon the queen. A letter from the duke to the queen from Cambrone of October 24, N.S., skilfully played upon Anne's idiosyncrasies. Her scheme of government independent of parties "might be practicable if both parties sought your favour, as in reason and duty they ought. But, Madam, the truth is that the heads of one party have declared against you and your government, as far as it is possible without going into open rebellion."

Behind the obstinacy of the queen were the promptings of Harley. It is surprising that, though Cowper suspected his straightforwardness in August,<sup>1</sup> yet as late as November 9, 1706, N.S., Marlborough, writing from the Hague, believed him to be unacquainted with the struggle that was going

<sup>1</sup> See two letters from William Cowper, keeper of the great seal, to the Duke [of Newcastle], August 13, 1706, *Portland MSS.*, ii., 195.

CHAP. on, and recommended Godolphin to take him into confi-  
VII. dence. The duchess had already warned Godolphin that he and St. John "were underhand endeavouring" to wreck the government. An access of whig influence threatened Harley's position, and it was natural that he should have no sympathy with the overbearing temper of Sunderland. Anne's resistance continued until the arrival of Marlborough in London on November 18, O.S. The persuasiveness of his appeals, the brilliancy of his services, and the popularity of his name at last succeeded in vanquishing her resolution. On December 3, the day of the opening of parliament, the changes were announced which thenceforth, in the public mind, united the ministry with the whigs. Sunderland became secretary of state in the place of Hedges; Cowper had already been created a peer; Wharton received the reward of his party management, and Godolphin of his success in achieving the union with Scotland in promotions to earldoms. A defiance was flung at the tory party by the removal from the privy council of the Duke of Buckingham, the Earls of Nottingham, Rochester, and Jersey, and Sir George Rooke. Matthew Prior, the poet, and others of less note were displaced from commissionerships of trade. The only tories of eminence left in office were Harley and St. John.

Upon the opening of parliament the satisfaction of the whig party was made apparent by the compliance of both houses. Within little more than a fortnight all the money bills were passed, and an unauthorised expenditure of £800,000 on the campaigns in Savoy and Spain approved by an overwhelming majority of 255 to 105 votes in the commons. With the thanks of the houses the Duke of Marlborough received a perpetual pension of £5,000 a year upon himself, the duchess, and their posterity, together with a settlement of his honours and estates upon his daughters and their issue successively. If the inclusion of Sunderland in the ministry had strengthened the position of Godolphin and Marlborough in parliament it had weakened their influence at court. "*Æterna est mulieris ira*," and Anne had an exceptional faculty for concealing resentment till the time came that she could gratify it. Nor did the acquisition of a secretaryship of state satisfy the appetite for power of the leaders of the junta. Their ideal was a purely whig administration. They were, therefore, bound to

Godolphin and Marlborough only so long as their assistance was rewarded by substantial recognitions. CHAP.  
VII.

The department of government in which Anne had always asserted her opinions was that of the Church, and it was in this quarter that the first storm arose. At the close of 1706, without consulting Godolphin, she promised Sir William Dawes and Dr. Blackall the two vacant sees of Chester and Exeter, a step involving political consequences, since the addition of two tory bishops imperilled the ministerial control of the house of lords. The whigs at once suspected that the nominations indicated a desire on the part of Godolphin to emancipate himself from their tutelage. Godolphin and Marlborough attributed Anne's headstrong act to the intrusion of a new influence. General suspicion pointed to Harley as the queen's secret adviser. Harley, writing to Marlborough, denied the imputation in categorical language. His denial was confirmed by the queen: "He [Harley] knew nothing of it till it was the talk of the town: I do assure you [Marlborough] these men were my own choice". This avowal served but to intensify the personal element in the discords now frequent between the queen and her two chief counsellors.

The confidence which Godolphin and Marlborough, notwithstanding their consciousness of his growing influence with the queen, continued to repose in Harley irritated the suspicions of the whigs. There were personal resentments harboured by members of the junta. Marlborough had refused Halifax a diplomatic appointment; Orford was vexed at his exclusion from the administration of the admiralty, which was practically controlled by the duke's brother, Admiral Churchill, the foremost member of Prince George's council. Among the commercial classes complaints were rife of the ineffectiveness of the navy in protecting commerce. A successful attack on the admiral, whom the duke himself described as "a very indiscreet tory," would at once render a public service, vacate another office for the promotion of a meritorious member of the junta, indicate to the queen that Prince George's continuance as lord high admiral might be rendered impossible, and prove to Marlborough and Godolphin that whig patience was at an end, that they must either identify the ministry with the whig party or be prepared for eviction from power. Fore-

CHAP.  
VII.

seeing the coming storm, Godolphin and Marlborough were in correspondence during the summer of 1707 as to the means of averting it. They had begun to recognise that Harley's influence with the queen was sufficiently strong to render the experiment of demanding his dismissal of doubtful wisdom, and the duke, at any rate, was deceived by his protestations of personal allegiance to them. "I have no attachment," Harley wrote to Godolphin, "to any other person in the world but your lordship and the Duke of Marlborough."<sup>1</sup> In July, Marlborough wrote to his duchess suggesting with confidence that the mere intimation to the queen that the instalment of Harley in Godolphin's place was the inevitable consequence of preferring Harley's counsel would suffice. "Then everything might go quietly." In October he contemplated the resignation both of Godolphin and himself, though he still doubted the queen's acceptance of it.

\* These stages in the appreciation of the crisis through which the two ministers were passing were associated with the gradual revelation that there was some one behind Harley. "Somebody or other," wrote the duke to the duchess on July 21, N.S., 1707, "I know not who has got so much credit with the queen that they will be able to persuade her to do more hurt to herself than we can do good." A week later, July 17, O.S., the duchess wrote a scolding letter to "Mrs. Morley," complaining of the influence upon her of a woman of the bedchamber, Abigail Hill. The queen replied, with covert sarcasm on the duchess, that Hill was "never meddling with anything". Abigail Hill, who, in the summer of 1707, became Mrs. Masham, was the daughter of a distressed Turkey merchant by a daughter of the duchess's grandfather, Sir John Jennings or Jenyns. Before Anne's accession she had been appointed a woman of the princess's bedchamber through the kind offices of the duchess. Modest in her demeanour and assiduous in her duties, she had conducted herself for a long while to the satisfaction of her patroness without exciting particular attention. On her father's side she was also the same relation to Harley as she was to the duchess, but Harley professed not to have been aware of the relationship till about the

<sup>1</sup> September 10, 1707, *Bath MSS.*, i., 180. For Godolphin's answer, see *ibid.*, p. 183, September 18.

beginning of 1708.<sup>1</sup> It is remarkable that among the Harley papers <sup>2</sup> no letter is to be found from Mrs. Masham before September 20, 1707, but a letter from Godolphin of a month earlier discloses his knowledge that Harley was her prompter. At that date the queen was to some extent in political correspondence with Harley,<sup>3</sup> while her former confidante, the duchess, had become a mere source of irritation. Outwardly submissive, Mrs. Masham made herself the echo of her royal mistress. She flattered her doctrine of government independent of party, especially of the whigs. How far this doctrine was hers, how far Harley's, cannot with certainty be affirmed. The practical outcome of it was that it pointed to Harley as its embodiment. Mrs. Masham foresaw that her future fortunes and those of Harley were linked together, and her letters attest the truth of Swift's description of her that she was a woman of "boldness and courage superior to her sex". The "uneasiness between the queen and the lord treasurer," of which Marlborough wrote in June, 1707, necessarily threw the duke and Godolphin yet more upon the support of the whigs, as their distrust of Harley and his followers increased. There are symptoms of a disposition to detach from them St. John, a man to whom the saying, "*alicui appetens, sui profusus*," was applicable. In July, Marlborough requested Godolphin, ~~not~~ for the first time, to increase St. John's emoluments as secretary at war. Godolphin was reluctant, but finally gave way, and lived, according to the Duchess of Marlborough, to regret his concession. It is true that St. John and Harley had been, as Godolphin phrased it, "particular friends" of Marlborough, and the assiduous goodwill of the secretary at war was indispensable to the general.

It had been decided upon the passing of the Act of Union, to continue the existing English parliament with the addition of the Scots members. This first parliament of Great Britain met on October 23, 1707. In the English house of commons

<sup>1</sup> Addison wrote to the Earl of Manchester on February 13, 1708, of the "bedchamber woman, whom it seems he (Harley) has found out to be his cousin". *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 8th Rep., App., ii., 95.

<sup>2</sup> *Portland MSS.*, iii., iv., v., vi.

<sup>3</sup> "Her Majesty approved of your letter to the Bishop" (Abigail Masham to Robert Harley, September 29, 1707, *Portland MSS.*, iv., 454). In January, 1708, Anne, who signed herself, "With all sincerity your very affectionate friend," was making apparently secret appointments with Harley (*Bath MSS.*, i., 189).

CHAP. VII. there had been 450 effective members in March, 1706. Of these the tories numbered 190, the whigs 160, and "the queen's servants" 100, of which last no more than eighty-five could be relied on against the tories.<sup>1</sup> The elections in Scotland returned forty-five members, the overwhelming majority of them of whig sympathies, though their general attitude was nationalist. They formed, in short, a flying squadron generally at the service of the whigs, except where international questions were concerned. It was hoped to render them an important addition to the influence of Godolphin and Marlborough. But fair words were not enough to pacify the irritated whigs. Their constituents were of the commercial class, neglect of whose interests would involve the loss of their own influence. When, therefore, 200 shipowners and merchants presented to parliament a remonstrance on the failure of the navy to protect trade, the junta could not hesitate to intervene. The facts were notorious. The Channel was harried by privateers from Dunkirk and Calais,<sup>2</sup> which landed armed parties on the English coast, burnt farmhouses, and plundered hamlets. For long voyages the convoys provided were inadequate, and the rule of the admiralty appeared to be that trade was to adjust itself to the convenience of the convoys rather than that the convoys should facilitate trade. Yet no expense had been grudged by parliament. While the main object of the whigs was to oust the controlling tory influence upon the lord high admiral's council, in the person of Admiral Churchill, the tories began to see their way to the eviction of the ministry. Rochester, Buckingham, and Haversham joined with alacrity in the attack which was led by Wharton in the house of lords on December 3, 1707. The culprits, they argued, were the queen's advisers, and as the council of the lord high admiral had no existence in constitutional law, these were represented by Godolphin and Marlborough. Both parties, in fact, were aware that the responsible person was the lord high admiral. The queen replied to an address by the lords of February 25, 1708, exhorting her that "sea affairs may be your first and most peculiar care" in terms of general assurance, but she laid up against the account of the whigs a fresh resentment.

<sup>1</sup> Godolphin to Harley, March 22, 1705-6, *Portland MSS.*, iv., 291.

<sup>2</sup> City Petition, R. O., MS., State Papers, Anne. bundle 12, no. 66.



Peterborough had arrived home, recalled by a peremptory letter from Sunderland,<sup>1</sup> on August 7, 1707. He was refused audience by the queen until he had furnished an explanation of his conduct in borrowing money at Genoa in the name of the government upon unreasonable terms, and in leaving Spain to embark in a circular tour of negotiations with foreign powers to which he was not accredited. As in the case of Rooke, the tories were in search of a hero by way of a foil to Marlborough and the whig favourite Galway. A literary campaign followed, of which Peterborough was himself the inspirer. His behaviour was extolled in a pamphlet, *Conduct of the Earl of Peterborough in Spain*, by Dr. Freind, who had been attached to his suite. From a hero he became a martyr. On December 19 Rochester denounced his ill reception by the ministry and suggested a vote of thanks. The proposal involved a censure of Godolphin and a condemnation of Galway. It was therefore doubly gratifying to the Jacobites, who had toasted the brave Englishman, Berwick, by whom the Frenchman, Galway, had been routed. The whigs, reinforced by the Scotch peers, rallied to Godolphin. It would in any case have been difficult to carry a resolution in face of the adverse judgment of Marlborough, and Peterborough, whose exculpations and justifications had exhausted the house, was obliged to go without his vote of thanks.

By way of retaliation, Rochester and Nottingham assailed Marlborough's conduct of the war in Flanders, and recommended the transfer of 15,000 or 20,000 troops from his command to Catalonia. This proposal hit the whigs in a vital spot, the maintenance of a close connexion with the Dutch, and was combated by Marlborough with a warmth unusual in him. The whig leaders dexterously converted the zeal of the tories for the fortunes of the archduke into a fresh support to their own position. In conjunction with the house of commons the lords presented an address to the queen on December 22, that no peace could be "honourable or safe" if Spain, the West Indies, or any part of the Spanish monarchy were suffered to remain under the power of the house of Bourbon. The tories having recently railed at the indifference of the ministry to

<sup>1</sup> The Earl of Sunderland to the Earl of Peterborough, January 14, 1706-7, *Bath MSS.*, i., 153.

CHAP. VII. the predominance of French commerce in the Mediterranean and the exploitation by French enterprise of Spanish America, had abandoned the right to oppose this declaration of principle which had, indeed, been originally laid down by Nottingham when secretary of state in 1704. Fortified by the arguments of Addison in a pamphlet entitled *The Present State of the War and the Necessity of an Augmentation Considered* (1708), this principle became thenceforward a leading formula of whig policy.

Five weeks later, January 29, 1707-8, the commons entered into a debate upon the war in Spain. As is usual with ministries, official defenders were found to demonstrate the care of the government for the efficiency of its forces. These apologies were of a sudden shattered by a stroke from an unforeseen quarter. Without communicating with Godolphin, St. John, secretary at war, laid upon the table of the house of commons the muster rolls of the English troops in the Peninsula in the spring of 1707. From these it appeared that of the 29,595 men voted for service as the English force in Spain and Portugal during the year, there were at the time of the battle of Almanza no more than 8,660 English troops in the whole Peninsula. The effect of this revelation was stunning. Men broke loose from the ties of political party. The extreme whigs united with the extreme tories in denunciations of the ministry.<sup>1</sup> On February 5, the house of commons presented an address to the queen demanding an explanation. Explanation there was, a fortnight later, that the English forces really amounted to nearly 14,000 men and that the complement had only been voted a short time previously, but the misrepresentation had the start and proved of damaging consequence. In this blow the hand of Harley was seen. Godolphin had already come to the end of his patience. On the night of the disclosure by St. John, Godolphin sent the attorney-general, Sir Simon Harcourt, a political friend of Harley, to announce the rupture of friendly relations.<sup>2</sup> Godolphin and Marlborough were indeed at last aware that Harley was secretly advising their dismissal and the substitution of a moderate tory administration under himself

<sup>1</sup> L' Hermitage, February 3-14, 1708; Bonet, February 6-17, 1708, Von Noorden, iii., 220.

<sup>2</sup> January 30, 1707-8, *ibid.*, p. 190.

and St. John. He was admitted to surreptitious audiences with the queen, generally in the evening, at hours he afterwards spoke of as "unreasonable," and the first disclosure of their interviews is said to have been due to a complaint by Prince George that the queen would sit up so late at night.<sup>1</sup> All that can be said for him is that he began by endeavouring to convert his colleagues, and that, failing in this, he aspired to the treasury for himself. That he deliberately fomented the "uneasiness" between the queen and Godolphin seems to have been the belief of all his contemporaries, of Addison among the whigs, of Swift among the tories, and of the foreign observers, Bonet and L'Hermitage.

Unfortunately for himself, Harley struck at the wrong time. A Scotsman named William Greg had been for some time in his confidential employment. In 1704 Greg had been employed by Harley as a secret agent to report on the proceedings of the Scottish parliament and the temper of Scottish parties. He returned to London in October, 1705, and the letters that he wrote to Harley shew that he was in a necessitous condition.<sup>2</sup> As he was a good French scholar, a much better one, he tells us, than Harley, he was given employment in the secretary of state's office. Here he was irregularly paid small sums which he seems to have begged from Harley when pressed by creditors. Harley's office was a welter of confusion. Rough draughts of letters of the highest consequence were left lying about in a room to which not only clerks but attendants had access.<sup>3</sup> There also passed through the office letters to and from French prisoners of war, among them those of Marshal Tallard, who was interned at Nottingham. Opportunity proffered a bait to poverty. Under cover of a letter of Tallard, Greg made overtures to Chamillart, the French minister of war, whom he engaged to furnish with copies of important state documents as they passed through his office. On November 28, 1707, he transcribed a letter from the queen to the emperor,

<sup>1</sup> Letters signed "Your very affectionate friend, Anne R.," one (January 21, 1707-8) appointing an interview in the morning, the second another for the next evening (January 27, 1707-8), are in the *Bath MSS.*, i., 189.

<sup>2</sup> W. Greg to R. Harley, April 10 and 15, 1707, *Portland MSS.*, iv., 400, 401.

<sup>3</sup> That these irregularities were inherited by Harley from the practice of Nottingham appears from a paper of Daniel De Foe censuring them, written about May or June, 1704, and printed in the *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, xxii. (Jan., 1907), 137.

CHAP. VII. pressing that Prince Eugene should be sent to Spain, which transcript would, in the course of post, reach Versailles before the original could arrive at Vienna. Greg's letter and inclosure being intercepted, he was arrested on December 30, 1707, and on January 19, 1708, put upon his trial for high treason, when he pleaded guilty.

At the same time two spies employed by Harley, John Bara and Alexander Valiere, *alias* John Clarke, were arrested for conveying intelligence from England to France. The moment had come, in the judgement of Marlborough and Godolphin, for decisive action. Greg's arrest had produced a public uncasiness. Ill-natured rumour was busy with the name of his patron, Harley. The two ministers wrote to the queen offering her the choice of their resignation or of Harley's dismissal. Moderate though Marlborough habitually was, his letter did not mince language. He denounced "the false and treacherous proceedings" of Harley to his colleagues. The queen shewing no sign of yielding, both ministers sought audience of her immediately before the sitting of the cabinet council on the morning of Sunday, February 9, and formally tendered their resignations. Anne had apparently resolved to part with Godolphin, but endeavoured to dissuade Marlborough from his intention. Marlborough resisted all persuasion and the two left the palace together. Upon the opening of the council Harley began a discussion on the imperial contingent of troops, business with the court of Vienna being in his department. He was interrupted by the Duke of Somerset. How, asked the duke, could they deliberate on such matters since the general was not with them? Both he and Lord Pembroke, the president of the council, offered to withdraw. The queen found no support and broke up the meeting.

Since Greg's plea of guilty precluded knowledge of the circumstances and extent of his crimes, a committee of seven lords was appointed by the house to examine him in Newgate after his condemnation to death. According to common report, party-rancour had reached such lengths that the whigs hoped to connect Harley directly with his clerk's treasons.<sup>1</sup> Even

<sup>1</sup> "K. O." to Edward Harley, March 4, 1707-8, *Portland MSS.*, iv., 479; cf. *ibid.*, p. 481. See also Swift to Archbishop King, February 12, 1707-8, *Works*, xv., 281-84.

the Jacobites appear to have suspected there was something behind.<sup>1</sup> No such suggestion appears in the formal report of the examination,<sup>2</sup> though Greg was asked, very properly, "by what instigation he was drawn in to correspond with the queen's enemies". Greg, however, constantly declared Harley's innocence, and upon the scaffold begged pardon for "basely betraying" his trust (April 28). Anne still remained obstinately determined to retain Harley, and Harley, according to Swift, had the scheme of a new ministry in his pocket. At this crisis the value to Marlborough of a representative of the Churchills in the tory camp manifested itself. Admiral George Churchill, grateful to his brother for his recent support against the attack on the admiralty, undertook to induce Prince George to exert his influence with the queen.<sup>3</sup> Harley was acute enough to be aware that, though he might replace Godolphin at the treasury, he could not form a ministry if the prince and his personal following joined the opposition. The queen, the day after the abortive council, consented with tears in her eyes to accept Harley's resignation. St. John had resolved to attach himself to his fortunes. He had gone too far to remain in a ministry controlled by the victorious whigs. Sir Simon Harcourt, the attorney-general, and Sir Thomas Mansell, who had come into office with him, resigned at the same time. Robert Walpole, now a leading whig, became secretary at war. He was intimate with the circle of the Duchess of Marlborough, and upon the admission of the Duke of Newcastle and other whigs to office in March, 1705, had been nominated one of the council of seven who advised the lord high admiral, Prince George. In this position he had commended himself to Marlborough as well as to the queen by his defence of Admiral Churchill. Sir James Montagu, brother of Lord Halifax, became solicitor-general, and Lord Cholmondeley comptroller of the household. Harley's secretaryship was transferred to Henry Boyle, since 1701 chancellor of the exchequer. On April 21 the speaker of the house of commons, John Smith, succeeded Boyle at the exchequer. Both were ardent

<sup>1</sup> Edward Harley's *Memoirs* in *Portland MSS.*, v., 648.

<sup>2</sup> A gossip letter with second-hand news states that in fact it was otherwise. "Wm. Greg's examination," *Portland MSS.*, iv., 484, March 31, 1708. So also Edward Harley's *Memoirs*, *ibid.*, v., 647.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, v., 647.

CHAP. whigs. By these changes the ministry both gained and lost.  
VII. It enlisted the hearty support of the rank and file of the whigs; it lost Harley and his personal followers, who henceforth divided with the opposition. With the support of the whigs and the placemen it retained substantial majorities.

During the interval that had elapsed since the Act of Union had been passed by the Scots parliament, government had been aware, by the reports of its secret agents,<sup>1</sup> of the rising tide of irritation in Scotland. The people resented the introduction of the English system of excise; the commercial classes were feeling the pressure of the new duties at the ports; the Darien shareholders were angry that a large slice of "the equivalent" had been allotted for extravagant allowances to the members of the two Scottish commissions for union; the great families regarded their consideration as impaired through the supersession by an English majority of some of their claims to hereditary jurisdiction,<sup>2</sup> the leading supporters of the union among the nobility anticipated that the extinction of the privy council for Scotland would involve the loss of honour and profit. "The whole kingdom is disaffected," wrote Harley's spy on October 18, 1707.<sup>3</sup> Report after report reached the courts of St. Germain's and Versailles exaggerating every manifestation of hostility to the government. The hopes of the exiles were quick to transmute discontent with the union into enthusiasm for the Jacobite cause.<sup>4</sup> In the spring of 1707, one Hooke, an Irish colonel in the French service, was dispatched as an emissary to organise a rebellion in Scotland. The Duke of Atholl authorised his signature to an invitation to the pretender. Thirty thousand men should be raised if 5,000 French troops were landed with arms and ammunition for the entire force. This memorial obtained no more than ten peers' signatures, but with it Hooke returned to France, full of confidence, in the June following.

Ministers were well served with intelligence. Prominent

<sup>1</sup> See especially the letters of Jean Gassion, *alias* Ogilvie, and of Daniel De Foe to Harley in *Portland MSS.*, iv.

<sup>2</sup> 6 Anne, c. 6. <sup>3</sup> Jean Gassion to Robert Harley, Edinburgh, *ibid.*, p. 457.

<sup>4</sup> Even De Foe reported: "Different interests, differing parties, all join in a universal clamour, and the very whigs declare openly they will join with France or King James or anybody rather than be insulted, as they call it, by the English". De Foe to Harley, Edinburgh, August 9, 1707, *ibid.*, iv., 433.

among the Jacobites for zeal was Ker of Kersland, an intriguing laird, who transmitted to Godolphin their plan to seize "the equivalent" stored at Edinburgh castle, the key to their cipher, and the lurking-places of their secret agents.<sup>1</sup> His influence with the Cameronians made him valuable to both sides. While in their name he exhorted the pretender to come over, he secretly inflamed them against a popish prince relying on a popish fleet and popish regiments to re-establish arbitrary power in Scotland. The reappearance of "whole nests of priests" lent point to his warnings.<sup>2</sup> Chamillart, the French war minister, bombarded by letters imploring instant action, was led to appreciate the effect of a successful diversion in Scotland upon the campaign in Flanders. At Dunkirk, in the early spring of 1708, he assembled eight sail of the line, twenty-four frigates, sixty-six long-boats, 13,000 stand of arms, and 6,000 French troops. It was a new crusade. The papal blessing, 100,000 crowns from the papal treasury,<sup>3</sup> and public prayers from the French prelates<sup>4</sup> furnished assurance of its success. A fleet of this importance was not likely to elude the vigilance of Marlborough and the Dutch government. In the middle of February the necessary orders for the concentration of the troops were given by the duke. On March 12 he wrote to Heinsius that all preparations were complete. Before leaving St. Germain's, Prince James put out a proclamation dated March 1, N.S., 1708. It promised a general amnesty to those who offered no resistance, and stigmatised the queen as "the usurper". Upon the subject of religion it expressed itself with an ambiguity which, as it relieved its author's conscience, could not have failed to inspire distrust in presbyterian and high churchman alike.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ker's receipts for secret service, signed by his own hand, were £700 on November 15, 1707; £300 on February 19, 1708; £100 on July 21, and £300 on October 1, 1709; and £500 on March 23, 1709-10, which last payment, it is to be noted, was made to him by the agency of the Duke of Roxburghe. R. O., MS., Secret Service, Anne, 1701-10, no. 266.

<sup>2</sup> See a letter from Jean Gassion to Harley, December 25, 1707, *Portland MSS.*, iv., 464-67.

<sup>3</sup> They had been lodged by the pope seven years before at a Paris banker's for this purpose. Louis XIV. to Cardinal Trémoille, March 8, 1708, Paris, Aff. étrang., Von Noorden, iii., 232, n. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Mary of Modena to the Archbishop of Arles, April 24, 1708, *Stuart Papers*, i., 221-22.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, i., 218.

CHAP.  
VII.

On March 10, N.S., James himself arrived at Dunkirk. He was in his twentieth year, at times pleasing in address, weak in health, with the training, as Bolingbroke afterwards discovered, rather of a monk than of a statesman, and when not engaged in hunting or correspondence, with a passion for carrying candles in religious processions. Misfortune dogged him from the outset. At Dunkirk he fell ill of a feverish attack which delayed his embarkation a week. Meanwhile the English admiralty, with a promptitude which retrieved much of their former discredit, dispatched Sir George Byng in command of a fleet of twenty-eight sail, afterwards reinforced by some Dutch ships. On the night of March 17, while Byng was sheltering from the rough weather at Nicuport, the French admiral Forbin weighed anchor. His plan was to land the prince at Leith, whence he might march promptly upon Edinburgh. Missing the Firth of Forth in the night of the 22nd, he was two days later sighted by Byng, and made northwards. The Jacobite exiles and the prince himself clamoured to be set on shore, but the weather was tempestuous; one ship had been captured, with the Jacobite Lord Griffin on board; only four sail of the line protected his transports, and nothing was left but to regain Dunkirk. At the end of three weeks' battle with winds and waves the expedition returned, having lost, from tempest, sickness, and capture, 4,000 men. Shortly before the start from Dunkirk a Jacobite agent named Fleming, brother of the Earl of Wigton, had been commissioned to organise concerted action in Scotland. But the national disposition to caution triumphed. No resistance was offered to a number of arrests of leading Scottish Jacobites, among them the Duke of Hamilton. Five gentlemen were put on their trial for high treason, but released upon a technical point, which led in the next parliament to an act assimilating in such cases the Scottish to the English procedure.<sup>1</sup> Lord Griffin was tried in London and sentenced to execution, but after two years' imprisonment he died a natural death in the Tower. A crowd of Scottish nobles and gentlemen who had been brought prisoners to London were discharged, among them Sir John Maclean.<sup>2</sup> Marlborough and

<sup>1</sup> 7 Anne, c. 21.

<sup>2</sup> Register of the Privy Council, Anne, vol. iv., pp. 105, 106, warrants for transfer of prisoners from military to queen's messengers and lists of prisoners. MS., Privy Council Office.



Godolphin were not men of blood, and contempt was more effective than punishment. CHAP.  
VII.

In London there seemed but one sentiment. Party divisions were obliterated by the flow of loyalty. At first, a general sense of security prevailed. Even while the French squadron was on its way to Scotland a new government loan was subscribed before the time had expired for closing the lists. But on March 12, sinister rumours were set afloat. The French had landed in Scotland; there was a general rising; the pretender was on the march to England. The funds fell 14 and 15 per cent. Opportunity was seized by the goldsmiths of London, with the great house of Child at their head,<sup>1</sup> to gratify their baffled rivalry and concert a run upon the Bank of England. The Jacobites were jubilant. With the credit of the Bank would disappear the credit of the government, and the Grand Alliance be undermined at its base. Godolphin was neither without courage nor resources. On the 16th he ordered the money in the treasury to be paid into the Bank. The queen, the Dukes of Newcastle, Somerset, and Marlborough, with others of the nobility and of the whig commercial magnates, and the Huguenot, Dutch, and Jewish houses, advanced thousands to its coffers. The shareholders cheerfully responded to a call of 20 per cent. on the capital. These combined exertions defeated the conspiracy. To defeat was added public odium, the house of commons declaring by a unanimous resolution on the 20th "that whoever designedly endeavoured to destroy or lessen the public credit, especially at a time when the kingdom was threatened by an invasion, was guilty of a high crime and misdemeanour, and was an enemy to her majesty and the kingdom". That the language of the pretender's proclamation had produced its natural effect upon the feelings with which Anne regarded the Jacobites is apparent from her answer to the addresses of the two houses at the close of the session on April 1. For the first time she stigmatised her half-brother as "a popish pretender, bred up in the principles of the most arbitrary government". To the whigs, as

<sup>1</sup> Sir Richard Hoare, head of another firm of goldsmiths, was accused of having collected banknotes and suddenly pressed them for payment, but he disclaimed the imputation, giving a detailed account of his proceedings. *Hurl. MSS.*, 5996, 153.

CHAP. VII. a party, the attempted invasion was a boon. Its failure raised their credit with the nation, while the dismissal of Harley and the resignation of St. John conveyed the impression that they enjoyed the favour of the queen, a valuable asset for the approaching elections. They now posed as the court party.<sup>1</sup>

With the ejection of Harley from office the alliance was dissolved between his personal following among the moderate tories and the ministry. There was now no half-way house between the whig and tory parties. Henceforth the government was entirely at the mercy of the whig majorities in the two houses. The time, the junta felt, had arrived when the change should be registered in the composition of the ministry. The crumbs of office dispensed to Boyle and Walpole were an inadequate recognition of the services rendered. The Dukes of Newcastle and Devonshire, therefore, as lord privy seal and lord steward, approached the queen in April, with the proposal that the Earl of Pembroke, who was also lord-lieutenant of Ireland, should resign the presidency of the council in favour of Lord Somers, the oracle of the whig party. Anne received the proposal with resentment, nor would she listen to the insidious alternative of calling Somers into the cabinet without office. His principles tended in her eyes "to tear that little prerogative the crown has to pieces". He was personally disliked by her husband, and one of the earliest acts of her reign had been to omit his name from the new privy council. In her dismay at finding that the whig proposal enjoyed the support of Godolphin, she wrote a passionate appeal to Marlborough.

Week after week passed during the spring and summer of 1708 in expostulation and recrimination between Godolphin and Marlborough on the one hand, and the queen, inspired through Mrs. Masham by Harley, on the other. Her obstinacy was encouraged by signs of defection from the junta. The Duke of Somerset, master of the horse, who had been active in procuring the dismissal of Harley, elated by his success, conceived the idea of forming a party on Harley's plan but upon the basis of moderate whiggism. The position of Godolphin after the general election of May became more

<sup>1</sup> Erasmus Lewis to Robert Harley, May 22, 1708, *Portland MSS.*, iv., 490. Cf. Lord Cowper to the Duke of Newcastle, October 4, 1708, *ibid.*, ii., 205.

insecure than before. In England the whigs, thanks to the attempt of the pretender, had secured a considerable majority. The junta was in a position to dictate terms. Again, therefore, Godolphin and Marlborough offered their resignations (August), Godolphin telling the queen outright that he would not come back from Newmarket. She replied that she hoped they would "both consider better of it," and appealed to Marlborough to keep her "from being thrown into the hands of the five lords".

Behind the scenes Mrs. Masham was fast rising in favour, aided by the splenetic outbursts of her rival. Wrangles by letter and passionate scenes wore out the last remnant of affection between the duchess and the queen. The duchess attacked Harley, the queen complained of Sunderland. In September, the duchess ceased to attend court, and Mrs. Masham was left for six weeks to the undisputed enjoyment of victory. The death of Prince George of Denmark, on October 28, was alike fortunate for the whigs and the ministry. It relieved Godolphin from the burden of defending the admiralty against a fresh attack, and it enabled the whigs to compensate the Earl of Pembroke by restoring him to the place of lord high admiral from which he had been dispossessed by Prince George. The junta secured his lord-lieutenancy for Wharton, who appointed as his secretary the whig poet, pamphleteer, and politician, Joseph Addison. The Tories, on the other side, were busy in drawing their party together. "You broke the party," wrote St. John to Harley, "unite it again." Its twin pillars were to be "the Church of England party" and the landed gentry; its rallying cry, "For God's sake, let us get out of Spain".<sup>1</sup> Harley responded to St. John's exhortation. Rochester, Shrewsbury, Bromley, and Harcourt were invited to share his counsels.

The loss of her husband broke the queen's spirit. "Oh, my poor aunt" (the queen), wrote Mrs. Masham to Harley, "is in a very deplorable condition, for now her ready money (courage) is all gone."<sup>2</sup> She held out no longer. The junta's victory was

<sup>1</sup> October 11, 1708, *Bath MSS.*, i., 191, 192. The party "will be in condition whenever the propitious day comes to lodge power where it naturally should be, with property". *Ibid.*, p. 194.

<sup>2</sup> November 6, 1708, *Portland MSS.*, iv., 511.

CHAP. complete. Somers was nominated president of the council and  
VII. Godolphin remained in office. Parliament met on November 18. By a compromise between the whigs and Godolphin, Sir Richard Onslow, a moderate whig, was elected speaker. The first-fruits of the whig control of the ministry appeared in parliament in a reiteration by the house of lords of their former resolution "that no peace can be safe and honourable until the whole monarchy of Spain be restored to the House of Austria". This at once exculpated the ministry in the eyes of the emperor from suspicion of complicity with the designs of Orleans,<sup>1</sup> and strengthened Marlborough against the peace party in the Netherlands. The whig majority in return stood by Godolphin against an assault in force for the neglect of preparations to resist the pretender in Scotland.

It was traditional with the opposition, mindful of Cromwell's major-generals, to impute to the whigs a tendency to militarise our national institutions. The drain caused by the war had long been felt. By acts of 1702 and 1703 insolvent debtors under forty years of age willing to serve were discharged from prison. In 1703, 1704, and 1705 acts had been passed for recruiting the navy and army by forcible enlistment of able-bodied men without visible means of subsistence. The bounty of 40s. payable to each volunteer for three years' service had been raised by the recruiting act of 1707 to £4. Proposals began to be discussed among the ministerialists for the introduction of some form of general compulsory service. Walpole, as secretary at war, suggested that the French system should be followed and that every parish should be responsible for raising a fixed quota of men. The tory party fulminated against French despotism, and were supported by a section of the extreme whigs, to whom liberty was genuinely of more account than the embarrassment of a ministry. No resource remained but to draw closer the meshes of the net. A premium was offered to the parishes to co-operate with the constables in securing able-bodied recruits. By a provision of the recruiting act of 1708 the sum of £3 was granted to the overseers of the poor for each man produced by the parish constable or other official to the recruiting officers, besides 20s., instead of 10s. under the earlier acts, to the constables "for every person they brought

<sup>1</sup> See p. 121.

before the magistrates to be imprisoned," *i.e.*, until taken over by the military.<sup>1</sup> Military service was converted into an agency for ratepayers' relief. CHAP.  
VII.

A bill introduced by Wortley Montagu,<sup>2</sup> a whig member best known to fame as the husband of the famous letter-writer, Lady Mary, for facilitating the naturalisation of foreign protestants afforded the High Church party an opportunity of reviving the spirit of religious bigotry. The high churchmen disliked the support to latitudinarianism lent by the influx of strangers to the forms and doctrines of the Church of England. They appealed also to economic apprehensions, to the anticipated lowering of wages by competition in the market for labour. On the other side were cited the liberal example of the King of Prussia, the value of the industries introduced into that country by French refugees, the wealth they brought into England, not less than £500,000 having recently been subscribed by them to the Bank, and their efficient military services. The case in their favour was so clear that the high churchmen were driven to a vain endeavour to exact conformity as the price of naturalisation, but by a large majority no more stringent condition was exacted than that the persons to be naturalised should take the oaths to the government and receive the sacrament in any protestant church. Bishop Burnet, to the scandal of the high churchmen, supported the measure in the lords, where on March 15 the leaders of the tory party, to the number of nine, recorded their protests against it.

In the course of the spring and summer of 1709 some of the forebodings of the tories appeared to be verified. During the two months from May 23 to July 27, 8,418 refugees landed here from Rotterdam alone.<sup>3</sup> Within a few weeks 2,000 aliens availed themselves of the increased facilities for naturalisation. The squares, the taverns, the refuges of London were crowded with protestants from the Palatinate flying from the persecution of their Roman catholic rulers. Tents were issued by the board of ordnance by order of the queen and an encampment of 6,500 formed on Blackheath.<sup>3</sup> "The case of the Palatines is all

<sup>1</sup> *Portland MSS.*, ii., 201.

<sup>2</sup> R. O., MS., Treasury Papers, Anne, 1709, vol. cxix.

<sup>3</sup> The Council of Trade to the Earl of Sunderland, June 1, 1709, *Blenheim MSS.*, p. 47, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 8th Rep., App. Also same to same, May 12, 1709, *ibid.*

CHAP. VII. our domestic talk," writes a London resident to a nephew in the country.<sup>1</sup> A royal proclamation invited collections in the churches in their behalf. Circulars were addressed to the county magistrates and municipal authorities all over the country by the lords of the council desiring them to find employment and assistance for the refugees.<sup>2</sup> Many were thus distributed in the provinces. "Our country has whole loads of them," wrote an inhabitant of Lichfield.<sup>3</sup> Many more the Quaker apostle, William Penn, selected for emigration to his transatlantic settlement, but his scheme became involved in his financial ruin, and these unfortunate persons, in want of the necessities of life, fell a burden upon the English poor rates. Three thousand were shipped to New York, over 600 to North Carolina; 3,000 took military service. A hundred families were ordered to be shipped to the Scilly Isles.<sup>4</sup> Eight hundred and twenty families, with the aid of a small grant from the Irish parliament and private subscriptions, were settled in Limerick and Kerry.<sup>5</sup> Wharton, as lord-lieutenant, was active in this work, which proved a not unmixed success. Protestant landowners, glad to welcome an influx of co-religionists, provided them with houses and assigned them lands "at easy rates and often at a third part less rents than the like lands were sett to other tenants" Nevertheless, having arrived with the expectation of receiving lands rent free from the crown, and perhaps also because their Irish neighbours laid "hold on any opportunity to abuse them," a large proportion of them soon began to drift away from their holdings, some to Dublin, others to England. A return of February, 1711, states that of 821 families, numbering 3,073 persons who had been brought to Ireland in 1709 and 1710, only 507 families and 2,051 persons were remaining. In 1712 there were stated by the commissioners to be only 263 families and 979 persons left in Ireland. Of

<sup>1</sup> R. Palmer to Ralph Verney, August 17, 1709, *Verney MSS.*, p. 507, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 7th Rep., App.

<sup>2</sup> Magistrates of East Riding to Duke of Newcastle, July 29, 1709. Magistrates of Notts to same, *Portland MSS.*, ii., 207. Lords of the Council to Mayor of Chester, June 29, 1709, *MSS. of Corporation of Chester*, p. 395, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 8th Rep., App.

<sup>3</sup> *Dartmouth MSS.*, iii., 147, August 23, 1709.

<sup>4</sup> R. O., MS., State Papers, Anne, bundle 15, no. 47.

<sup>5</sup> *Stair MSS.*, p. 231, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 2nd Rep., App. (Correspondence of Archbishop King).

those settlers it is, indeed, added that they were employing themselves industriously in raising flax and hemp. Their descendants are still known in some parts of Ireland by the name of "Palatines".<sup>1</sup>

CHAP.  
VII.

The energetic temper of Wharton resolved to signalise his lieutenancy by building up the whig party in Ireland. The test, in his eyes, was a mischievous wedge introduced between the two great protestant bodies to the weakening of the entire protestant interest. Wharton's scheme to repeal it revived the movement for a union with England; the threatened monopolists, the prelates, and the great landowners looking to a union for an assurance of their supremacy. But the Irish house of lords was willing, in the meanwhile, to strengthen the protestant interest in another way. An act more irritating than effective was passed<sup>2</sup> in 1709 having for its object the gradual devolution of land from papists to protestants. Children of Roman catholics, upon conforming to the established Church, were protected from being disinherited and were entitled to claim their share of the inheritance during their fathers' lifetime. Wharton also showed sympathy with the nationalist or Irish party, that is, the industrial and mercantile classes, of whom Archbishop King was the leader. But neither his English colleagues nor the English commercial classes were in a mind to strike off the fetters imposed upon Irish trade. The addresses for a union in 1703 and 1707 had found no encouragement, and Somers and Sunderland now blamed Wharton's headstrong zeal for Irish interests.

Since the middle ages, it had been customary to pass acts of grace relieving the mass of delinquents against the crown of forfeitures or other penalties. No such act had been passed since the accession of Anne. It was, however, much to the interest of distinguished politicians of both parties that a sponge should be passed over relations of a treasonable character with the exiled family. That both Godolphin and Marlborough had maintained a correspondence with St. Germain's had long been common rumour, and none was so sensible as they of the insecurity of their tenure of office and of the possibility

<sup>1</sup> Report of "Commissioners for settling the poor distressed Palatines in Ireland". Hardwicke Papers, vol. dlxxxv., Brit. Mus., Add. MSS., 35,933, f. 12.

<sup>2</sup> 8 Anne, c. 3, Ireland.

CHAP. of impeachment by their successors. Tories, on the other  
VII. hand, who had been similarly guilty, were acutely conscious  
that their impunity depended on the life of the queen, and  
that the Elector of Hanover was likely to show them no  
favour. When, therefore, on April 20, Sunderland introduced  
a bill for a general pardon, including high treason, neither  
side felt it to be its interest to oppose. Only those who  
had accompanied the pretender in his descent on Scotland  
were excepted by the proviso that the treasons pardoned  
should not comprise those committed on the high seas.



## CHAPTER VIII.

### THE BARRIER TREATY.

CHAP.  
VIII.

THE successes in the Netherlands of the campaign of 1708 and the notorious exhaustion of France once more elated the Dutch war party, and the States-general responded with an augmentation of 6,000 men to the additional 10,000 voted by the British parliament. The winter of 1708-9 was spent by Marlborough in the Netherlands and by Eugene at Vienna in organising the allies for the next effort. Jealousies and grievances between the emperor and Savoy, Prussia and Hanover needed all the diplomacy of Marlborough to assuage them. Prolonged persuasion extracted from Frederick I. a promise of 31,200 Prussian troops. A fresh accession of strength to the Grand Alliance from the east was frustrated by a curious incident. In May, 1708, Peter the Great, anxious to be admitted to the comity of nations, made an offer to Heinsius, Marlborough, and Eugene of an auxiliary corps. His conditions were a guarantee of his conquests in the Baltic and support, if necessary, against the Scandinavian kingdoms. To the maritime powers, jealous of an intruder into the European system, the proposal and the conditions were alike embarrassing. In July while negotiations were pending, Peter's ambassador was, in violation of international usage, arrested for debt by one Morton, a London laceman, and some other creditors. The privy council ordered the arrest of seven of the principal persons concerned in the outrage and offered due apology to the ambassador. It was found, however, that, save by indictment for riot, no penalty could be exacted from the offenders. A formal demand by Peter for their capital punishment was refused, and the tsar in offended dignity withdrew his overtures.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See 7 Anne, c. 12 (1708).

CHAP.  
VIII.

The best prospect of peace was to be found not in the preparations of the allies but in the exhaustion of France. To financial distress was now added the calamity of famine. But the overtures for peace which had followed Ramillies were not renewed by the French at the opening of 1707. Hope had revived. In July of that year a violation of the understanding among the allies not to seek exclusive advantages unknown to the others was committed by the English envoy at Barcelona. General James Stanhope forced upon the reluctant archduke a secret treaty of commerce admitting English ships to trade with the West Indies upon the same terms as Spanish vessels during the war, and after the conclusion of peace granting England the exclusive privilege of sending ten ships yearly, of 500 tons, to Spanish colonies in America. A copy of this treaty, captured at the beginning of 1708, was transmitted by Louis XIV. to the States-general and might, it was thought, lead to an open rupture. There was the chance, also, of a successful attempt by the pretender upon Scotland, and a hope of the turn of the political wheel in England.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, in the autumn of 1707, Petkum, the Duke of Schleswig-Holstein's envoy at the Hague, a well-meaning political busy-body, took upon himself to begin a correspondence with Torcy, as to the probable conditions of peace.<sup>2</sup> The correspondence did little more than keep alive the impression that France was willing to come to terms, but it demonstrated Torcy's political foresight of the obstacle to a settlement. "The king" (Philip V.), he wrote in 1707, "would rather die than give up Spain and the Indies . . . so even if we accepted your suggestion, he could refuse to do so."<sup>3</sup>

In the opinion of the English ministry, a definite arrangement between England and Holland of open questions was the best preliminary to a general peace. Accordingly, in March, 1709, Marlborough was commissioned to negotiate a treaty comprising a settlement of both the barrier and the British succession. Conscious of the difficulty of his position as commander-in-chief of the allied forces, the duke proposed the appointment of a second negotiator. The choice fell upon

<sup>1</sup> Torcy to Petkum, October 6, 1707, *Round MSS.*, p. 322.

<sup>2</sup> The correspondence is among the *Round MSS.*, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 14th Rep., App., pt. ix.

<sup>3</sup> Torcy to Petkum, October 30, 1707, *ibid.*, p. 322.

Lord Townshend, a young peer who had recently abandoned the tory party and attached himself to Somers. He was of an impulsive temper, but recommended himself to foreign diplomatists by his knowledge and uprightness.

CHAP.  
VIII.

On May 18, Marlborough arrived at the Hague and was joined by Townshend. The principal French plenipotentiary was the Marquis de Torcy, who has left us a picture of the contrast between the two leading figures of Europe. On the one hand, the simple and concise address of the grand pensionary; on the other, the involved sentences, the sympathetic expressions, the regrets for the obstinacy of his countrymen, the appeals to duty and conscience, the invocations to the Almighty, the captivating manners with which Marlborough decked his discourse. The experience of Louis XIV. with the diplomatists of the continent had persuaded him that Marlborough, too, had his price. But, whatever justification there may have been for the imputation of acquisitiveness, Marlborough, judged by the standards of that day, was an honest man. Torcy unfolded to him a table of the concessions asked and the sums offered. For Naples, for the maintenance of Dunkirk, for the reservation of Strasbourg to France, he promised 2,000,000 l.vres apiece. The duke blushed and turned the conversation. The proposals, renewed in various forms, only served to confirm the belief that the French powers of resistance were at an end.

On the 28th, the plenipotentiaries of England, the States-general, and the emperor signed an ultimatum of forty articles by way of "preliminaries" to a treaty of peace. These they placed in Torcy's hands. For England they demanded acknowledgement of the queen's title and of the protestant succession, the cession of Newfoundland, the dismantlement of Dunkirk, the withdrawal of the pretender from France, and a treaty of commerce between the two countries. To the Dutch the French were to cede seven towns, including Lille. Besides these, all the towns in the Spanish Netherlands which had been taken by the French were to be restored, to be occupied as a barrier so far as might be agreed upon between the allies, and otherwise to revert with the other dominions of the Spanish crown to Charles III. The Dutch were also to have Upper Guelderland and the enjoyment of the low commercial

CHAP. VIII. tariff with France fixed in the year 1664. To these demands the preliminaries, when completed, added the exclusion of French trade from the Spanish Indies and reserved additional claims to be made by the allies at their discretion at a general congress. By this provision it was hoped to avert the discontent of the Duke of Savoy and the Kings of Portugal and Prussia. France was to bind herself to secure the surrender of the Spanish monarchy to Charles III. within two months after June 1, 1709. By article 37, in the event of a refusal on the part of Philip V. to abdicate, French troops were to assist the allies in enforcing the evacuation of Spain.

At the court of Versailles the proposals of the allies were received with indignation. Louis would not be responsible for the abdication of his grandson, still less would he undertake to treat as hostile the Spanish people in return for their attachment to the legitimate heir to the Spanish throne. The unlooked-for rejection of the preliminaries transformed the widely-spread hope of peace into exasperation. On June 7 the States-general declared their resolution "to adhere to the preliminaries and to push the war with all possible vigour". The articles were published that they might serve as a bond between the allies and an unimpeachable standard for the future. The result was other than had been expected. Each minor member of the alliance conceived his claims neglected. Marlborough, who had carried out the instructions of the English ministry, sided with Eugene in declaring that, in his individual opinion, the thirty-seventh article should be reconsidered. Heinsius reopened to Torcy his former proposal of a substantial security that Louis would do his best. But the British cabinet foresaw that if it accepted the surrender of certain cautionary towns, the Dutch would take no further interest in the sovereignty of Spain. Still, the pressure of opinion compelled an attempt at compromise. Marlborough having rejoined the army, Townshend received instructions that the only satisfactory substitute for the thirty-seventh article would be the surrender of such Spanish fortresses as would render the reduction of Castile certain. It was not for one in his position, wrote Marlborough to Heinsius, to gainsay positive directions, but the demand was more than the King of France had it in his

<sup>1</sup> *Hare MSS.*, p. 224.

power to fulfil. Townshend, however, insisted on this as the irreducible minimum, and persuaded the States-general to confirm it by a resolution on August 30. Torcy thereupon broke off the renewed negotiations.

While this diplomatic contest was being waged with France, Townshend proceeded with the other part of his commission, the completion of the barrier treaty with the Dutch. The conflict of interests between the English and Dutch turned upon the number of the barrier towns. These Dutch commercial jealousy might close, at least partially, to British trade. The concern of the English, therefore, was to limit their number, and for this they could plead their obligation to conserve the rights of the titular King of Spain. The Dutch, on the other hand, had become anxious to avoid a formal committal to the enforcement of the evacuation of Spain or the dismantlement of Dunkirk. Upon the necessity of the incorporation of these two points in the barrier treaty Marlborough was insistent.

At this crisis an event occurred which heightened the disinclination of the Dutch to commit themselves irrevocably to British policy in Spain. The communication by Louis XIV. to the States-general in 1708 of the secret treaty with the archduke of July, 1707, had excited resentment against England even among its warmest friends. It now became known that a further step in the direction of exclusive advantages for England had recently been taken. In January, 1709, the English ministers, determined not to abandon Port Mahon, proposed to the archduke the formal cession of the whole island of Minorca. The excuse put forward by Charles that his oath to the Cortes of Aragon forbade him to diminish the territory of Spain was parried by the ingenuity of Craggs, Stanhope's deputy as resident at Barcelona, and a treaty was executed in August, 1709, by which England took over the island as a pledge for the expenses it had been put to in the war. The secret was not long oozing out. Heinsius indignantly denounced to Townshend this breach of the Grand Alliance,<sup>1</sup> by the terms of which no contracting party was at liberty to obtain private advantages at the expense of the other. The consequence was that Townshend felt compelled to give way

<sup>1</sup> Townshend, *The Hague*, September 6 and 10, 1709, Von Noorden, iii., 596

CHAP. upon the points at issue in the negotiations for the barrier  
VIII. treaty. Marlborough, however, who during the campaign had left him the sole conduct of the negotiations, protested that he would not sign the concessions demanded by the Dutch. "This treaty," wrote Swift, "was only signed by one of the plenipotentiaries, and I have been told the other was heard to say he would rather lose his right hand than set it to such a treaty."

By the barrier treaty of October 29, the Dutch received an extension of the right of garrisoning the Spanish Netherlands enjoyed by them at the death of Charles II. of Spain, including some twenty fortified towns. The whole territory of the Schelde and the Meuse was to become tributary. In revival of their rights under the treaty of Münster (1648) they were at liberty to close the Schelde, thereby, as the English merchants of Bruges protested, grievously injuring English trade with the surrendered frontier towns of French Flanders. Further, England was pledged to support the claim of the republic to Upper or Spanish Guelderland and to the occupation of Liège, Huy, and Bonn, towns belonging to princes of the empire. Townshend had both exceeded his instructions and involved his country in disputes with the other allies. The council hesitated to ratify the treaty.<sup>1</sup> Met by Heinsius with menace of a rupture, it had no alternative but to yield. In exchange for a treaty which established the supremacy of the Dutch republic in North-Western Europe, made it master, under a titular sovereignty, of Flanders and Belgium, and added to its dominions the places conquered from France, the advantages secured by England were hypothetical. It is scarcely fair to exclude, as Swift does in *Some Remarks on the Barrier Treaty*, the collateral acquisition by England of Minorca to which the ample concessions of the barrier treaty were, in part, a set-off. On the face of the treaty the reciprocity clauses were limited to an undertaking by the republic not to conclude peace except upon the conditions that Louis XIV. should recognise the queen's title and the succession of the house of Hanover. Yet to the Dutch the protestant succession in England was of the first importance and its main-

<sup>1</sup> Boyle to Townshend, November 18, 1709, R.O., M.S., State Papers, Foreign Entry Books, Holland, 75.

tenance must, in any case, have attracted their support. The only unquestionable gain was the imposition of a condition fettering the activities of the Dutch peace party and the prevention of a disastrous quarrel between the two maritime powers. The British cabinet also intimated that the balance must be redressed by concessions in other directions. "The Queen," wrote Boyle to Townshend,<sup>1</sup> "trusts she may get a substantial *quid pro quo* in the West Indies." Marlborough urged "the renewing of the Grand Alliance upon the footing of the preliminaries". Some antidote was indeed needed for the disintegrating effect produced by the publication of the treaty. The emperor was threatening to withdraw from the alliance. Frederick of Prussia incensed, as the British ministry had foreseen, at being forestalled in the matter of Guelderland, could only be pacified by Marlborough's assurances of compensation elsewhere. The tightening of the bond between the maritime powers had weakened the cohesion of the rest of the alliance.

The negotiations for peace carried on during the first half of 1709 were accompanied by renewed energy in recruiting on the part of the combatants. In May, the army of the allies was estimated to be 25,000 men stronger than in the previous campaign,<sup>2</sup> and when it finally assembled between Courtray and Menin on June 21 it numbered at least 110,000 troops. Famine furnished recruits to the French, justifying Louis XIV.'s saying that hunger would compel men to follow his bread waggons. Yet no more than 80,000 could be mustered for the army of the Netherlands. Louis now entrusted his army to Marshal Villars, a soldier whose rise had not been due to his assiduity as a courtier, who was popular with the troops and as yet undefeated in the field. France felt that its existence as a nation depended upon the defence which he could offer. It was an age in which Vauban in France and Coehoorn in Holland had impressed upon soldiers the value of defensive works. Villars compensated by the diligence of his engineers for his inferiority in the open. His lines were too formidable to be attacked and he could not afford to

<sup>1</sup> November 18, O.S., R.O., MS., State Paper, Foreign, Holland, 233.

<sup>2</sup> Francis Hare to George Naylor, Hague, May 10-21, 1709, *Hare MSS.*, p. 223.

CHAP. risk a pitched battle. Marlborough and Eugene began by  
VIII. laying siege to Tournay. After a month's resistance the city  
surrendered on July 28, the network of mines by which it was  
defended having cost the besiegers 3,000 men; but the citadel  
continued to hold out till September 3, when "the finest and  
strongest fortification in Europe"<sup>1</sup> capitulated.

Without waiting for the garrison of 4,000 men to march  
out, Marlborough on the same afternoon<sup>2</sup> detached the  
Prince of Hesse in a south-easterly direction with 10,000  
men, and at midnight followed with his main army. Infor-  
mation had reached him that the garrison of Mons was weak,  
and the prince had instructions to force the intrenched posi-  
tion called "the lines of the Trouille," running south-south-  
east from Mons to the Sambre. No sooner did Villars perceive  
the objective of the allies than he crossed the Schelde at Valen-  
ciennes, hoping to surprise the prince before the arrival of the  
main body of the allies, and to be found intrenched with the  
guns of Mons at his rear. But Marlborough and Eugene had  
been too quick for him. On the 9th Villars, advancing from  
Bavay, found the army of the allies between his own and Mons.  
The country in this neighbourhood was covered with woods,  
clearances in which afforded access to Mons from the west,  
either along the banks of the river Haine—the route taken  
by the allies—or to the south by a clearance of which the  
village of Malplaquet was the centre. By this route, where  
the open space was wide enough to allow twenty squadrons  
of horse to ride abreast, Villars advanced so rapidly that  
the allies had scarcely time enough to draw up their forces  
to meet him. Their guns had not come up,<sup>3</sup> and a recon-  
naissance by the enemy threw them into some confusion.  
The French, however, not pushing their advantage, the allies  
succeeded in taking up a position at the north-east end of  
the clearance, with a gentle rise between themselves and the  
enemy.

<sup>1</sup> Col. E. Revett to D. Polhill, Tournay, July 21-August 1, 1709, *Ashtley MSS.*, p. 298.

<sup>2</sup> So Marlborough to Boyle, September 7, 1709, in Murray's *Dispatches*, iv., 590, and Dr. Hare in the *Hare MSS.*, p. 228. The Austrian war office's account of the campaign corroborates this date. Von Noorden (iii., 523) gives August 31.

<sup>3</sup> Lord Orkney's letter, September 16, 1709, in *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, xix. (April, 1904), 316-21.



In the opinion of military experts,<sup>1</sup> had either side ventured an immediate attack, it would probably have been successful. A considerable force, roughly estimated at 10,000 men, had been left behind by the allies at Tournay, and this rendered the numbers in both armies approximately equal, the French having been reinforced to 90,000 men. The clearance at the south-west end of which the French army lay, the allies occupying the north-east of it, was skirted on the French right by the wood of Lanierie and on their left by that of Taisniere, the end of which nearest the allies was called the wood of Sart.<sup>2</sup> In the woods on his right Villars stationed two lines of infantry; in the clearance on their left his cavalry, forming the centre of the army, in four lines. His left wing was advanced to within sight of the allies, and lay in the wood of Taisniere. When the allies were drawn up in order of battle on the morning of September 10, Eugene commanded on their right wing with the imperial and Danish troops, Marlborough the centre and left with the English, Prussians, Dutch, and Hanoverians. Opposed to the French right were the Dutch guards, led by the youthful Prince of Orange. Lord Orkney was posted with fifteen British battalions to support the centre. Behind Orkney was the Prince d'Auvergne at the head of the cavalry.

As the allies in order of battle stood to their arms, it was at once seen that Villars had utilised the night to throw up formidable defences, described by Lord Orkney as "three, four, and five retrenchments, one behind another". Neither side being disposed to attack, the French continued this work during the day. Time having been allowed for the march of the force from Tournay under General Withers, the command was given to attack on the following morning. The battle began on the 11th by an endeavour of the German auxiliaries to clear the wood of Sart on their extreme right and that of Taisniere, which lay behind it, so as to turn the barricades,

<sup>1</sup> *Cesterr. Kriegs- Archiv, Prinz Eugen, 1709*, with which Lord Orkney appears to agree.

<sup>2</sup> The names given to the various woods differ so much in German and French writers and in the Austrian general staff's history, that I have judged it best for English readers to adopt the nomenclature of Coxe in his excellent plans of the battle. Substantially, the accounts agree. I have mainly followed the Austrian official account and the graphic narrative of the Earl of Orkney, then a lieutenant-general.

CHAP. which were to be attacked by the English in front. At this  
VIII. last point, in advance of Malplaquet, Villars commanded in person. While the attack was proceeding, the Prince of Orange, who was on the left and had been instructed not to advance without orders, impatiently hurled the left wing, chiefly composed of the Dutch troops, against the French barricades in front of him. Exposed to a cross-fire, the Dutch lost in a few minutes 2,000 men, and, despite the heroic efforts of the prince, retired in confusion. Instantly the French poured in pursuit through the openings between their retrenchments. The completeness of their defences proved an obstacle, and they could only emerge in small bodies. The delay gave Marlborough, who had hurried to the spot, his opportunity. Ordering the Prince of Hesse's cavalry to check the French advance, he found time to reform his shattered left wing. After two hours' fighting with various vicissitudes, the French right wing was driven out of the woods. The further course of the battle now depended upon whether the French commander could by means of his reserves rally his left wing, then hard pressed by the Prussians. At this critical moment Withers and the reinforcements from Tournay arrived on the scene and attacked the extreme left of the French in the flank. Villars kept his head and withdrew a considerable body of troops from his centre to form front to his fresh assailants, but was wounded in the knee, and carried fainting from the field, the command being then taken over by Marshal Boufflers, who had led the right wing.

The fortunes of the day were still wavering when Marlborough ordered an assault by the fifteen British battalions held in reserve under Orkney against the weakened French centre. It was defended by the troops of the Electors of Bavaria and Cologne, who fled with scarcely any resistance. But the French cavalry again and again charged the British and "had not the foot been there they would have drove our horse out of the field".<sup>1</sup> By 3 P.M. the French left and centre had been driven from their defences. Boufflers decided on retreat. His army retired in order, part to Valenciennes, part to Le Quesnoy. The allies were too exhausted to pursue.

The victory was won, but won at a price which made it

<sup>1</sup> Lord Orkney's letter, cited above.

scarcely more tolerable than a defeat. The attack on the French defences cost the assailants 22,939 men killed and wounded, while the French, protected by their intrenchments, lost only 11,000.<sup>1</sup> Nineteen cannon, fifty standards and colours and many prisoners fell into the hands of the allies. Among the enemy's wounded was the pretender.

Marlborough, whose letters to the duchess testify to his longing for peace, at first overestimated the probable consequences of his success. "It is now in our power," he wrote on the evening after the battle, "to have what peace we please." But despite a formal thanksgiving and a revival of confidence in Marlborough's invincibility, which Godolphin utilised to obtain an advance from the Bank, a disposition to pessimism, sedulously spread by the Jacobites, presently set in. Mons surrendered on October 21. Without further delay the combatant armies sought winter quarters. In the rest of the theatre of war the campaign of the allies proved inglorious. A double invasion of France from Alsace and Savoy had been arranged in combination with that from the north-west. The imperialist army of the Upper Rhine, under the Elector George of Hanover, was to rouse to revolt the discontented inhabitants of Alsace, while the Duke of Savoy, at the head of another force, was to rekindle the smouldering embers of insurrection in the Cevennes. In the event of success, the two were to form a junction at Lyons. Victor Amadeus, however, refused to act with the Austrian general Daun, while the elector's advance force of 6,000 men under Count Mercy, on its march southwards, was driven back across the Rhine. These initial difficulties paralysed both commanders. While the elector remained inactive, Daun recrossed the Alps. The failure revealed once more the weakness inherent in confederate action.

While in England and Holland the feeling expressed itself that the abandonment of Spain by the French candidate was the indispensable preliminary of peace, Philip V. defiantly declared: "God has placed the crown of Spain on my head and I will maintain it as long as a drop of blood flows in my veins". He threw himself upon the Spanish national feeling and the Spaniards responded to the appeal. Anxious in the first place to insure the protestant succession by strengthening

<sup>1</sup> Œsterr. Kriegs-Archiv.

CHAP.  
VIII.

the Dutch republic against France, the English whigs were indisposed to unlimited sacrifices in Spain. The queen had already, the emperor's ambassador was told, done more than her share for Charles III. All she would now do was to land 2,400 imperial troops in Catalonia and find their pay. In the west of Spain Galway was in command of 2,800 British, the nucleus of an army of 15,000 men with which he intended again to besiege Badajoz. Owing, however, to the misconduct of the Portuguese, his army was defeated at Gudina by the Spanish general Bay on May 7, 1709, and from thenceforth he refused to take the field with Portuguese troops. In Catalonia the Austrian commander Stahremberg, outnumbered by the combined French and Spanish troops, could do little more than maintain himself in an impregnable position. The sole gleam of good fortune for the archduke was the recall of the French troops, in the course of the autumn, to France.

When in May, 1710, Philip V. assembled his troops at Lerida, on the western frontier of Catalonia, they numbered 22,000 men. Against these the allies, under Stahremberg and Stanhope, who had returned from England, mustered 24,500, of whom 4,200 were British, 14,000 German, 1,400 Dutch, and the rest Spanish and Portuguese. At the pressing instances of Stanhope, Stahremberg agreed to take the offensive. After surprising Philip at Almenara on July 27 and inflicting on him a loss of nearly 1,000 killed and wounded, the allies pressed forward upon Saragossa. On August 19 a battle was fought under the walls of the city which ended in the complete rout of the Bourbon army. Twenty cannon, sixty-three colours, and 4,000 prisoners were taken, and 3,000 men killed and wounded. The loss of the allies was 2,000, but an oft-expressed wish of Stanhope of "a day to retrieve Almanza" was at length gratified. The inhabitants of Saragossa, who had watched the combat from their walls, acclaimed the re-entry of Charles. As throughout the campaign, Stanhope was for enterprise, Charles and Stahremberg for caution. The occupation of Madrid, urged Stanhope and Wills, the commander of the English foot, would strengthen the position of the allies in the negotiations for peace. Stanhope forced compliance with his views by a declaration that his court was weary of maintaining an indecisive warfare. On September 21, at the head of

1,000 horse, the vanguard of the allies, he occupied the capital. A week later Charles made his state entry. Houses and shops were shut and the streets empty. "The city," he exclaimed, "is a desert."

CHAP.  
VIII.

But the reversal of the fortune of war in Aragon was not the conquest of Castile. Vendôme, whose services had previously been refused to Philip, joined him in September at Valladolid, where he assembled 25,000 Spanish and French troops. Once more, with the occupation of Madrid, there had been a turn of the tide. On November 11 the approach of the enemy, the shortness of supplies, and the hostility of the population compelled an evacuation. The Archduke Charles, at the head of an escort of 2,000 cavalry, made straight for Barcelona, then threatened by the Duke de Noailles from Roussillon. Owing to the difficulty of obtaining provisions, the retreating allies were formed into several columns, marching with considerable intervals between them. Stanhope, in command of 2,500 British, who formed the rearguard, was surprised by Vendôme at Brihuega on December 9, and, after a gallant defence, compelled to surrender. Too late, Stahremberg hurried to his relief, and at Villa Viciosa gained a brilliant but barren victory. He was forced to continue his retreat. In less than four months after the allies' victory of Saragossa, Vendôme had retrieved the fortunes of Philip, while an immense moral impression had been produced by the fidelity of the Castilians in their king's adversity. The article of whig political doctrine that the future of Spain could be settled by a bargain between London and Paris had received a fatal shock. Once more the archduke found himself confined to a strip of seaboard, with impaired resources and darkened prospects.

In the critical state of affairs at home, when a defeat might involve his ruin, Marlborough was disposed to caution. The plan of campaign for 1710 concerted with Eugene had for its object the reduction of the remaining French frontier fortresses, which would clear the way for an advance on Paris at a later date. Marlborough, foreseeing the fruitlessness of the negotiations then being renewed at Gertruydenberg, reached Tournay from the Hague on April 18. The French were expecting reinforcements from the Upper Rhine and were unprepared for the rapidity of Marlborough's advance. They precipitately

CHAP. abandoned their fortified lines near La Bassée, north-west of  
VIII. Douay, along the canal running from Douay to Lille. "I bless God," wrote Marlborough, "for putting it into their heads not to defend their lines; for at Pont de Vendin, where I passed, the Mareschal d'Artagnan was with 20,000 men, which, if he had stayed, must have made it very doubtful." On April 23 Marlborough invested Douay. The defence of the town was conducted with skill and vigour, while Villars, accompanied by the pretender and Berwick, assembled an army of relief in the neighbourhood of Cambray. Villars, however, found the lines of the allies unassailable, and seeing no hope of relief, the town capitulated on June 26. It had cost the allies dear—over 2,000 killed and 5,865 wounded. Villars, who had drawn troops from the Rhine and from Dauphiné, now boasted that 160,000 men were under his command. In face of his superiority in numbers, the allies were unable to do more than reduce a few minor fortresses,<sup>1</sup> and in November went into winter quarters. The French had, though with the loss of Douay, effected their principal object, namely to cover Arras and prevent the invasion of Picardy and attacks upon Abbeville and Calais.

Both sides had weakened their troops on the Rhine in order to strengthen those in Flanders; nor had the emperor and the German princes redeemed their promises of reinforcements. The elector, George of Hanover, the imperialist commander-in-chief, finding himself short of men and money, after futile remonstrances with the emperor, resigned his command on May 20, 1710. For the rest of the summer the imperialist and French armies, each too weak to attack, occupied their fortified lines in watchful inactivity. Again, as in 1709, plans for a flank invasion of France proved failures. While Marshal Daun with the imperial and Piedmontese troops was to rouse the protestants of Dauphiné, a diversion was to be made by the English among those of Languedoc. With this object a force of 700 English soldiers was embarked at Barcelona by Admiral Sir John Norris and landed at Cette on July 19, in

<sup>1</sup> The heavy losses incurred in these sieges provoked lively complaints. According to the metrical history, *The Remembrance*, by John Scot, the official lists shewed the total losses at Douay, Béthune, St. Venant, and Aire to have been 18,901 killed and wounded. *Scottish Hist. Soc.*, vol. xxxviii., p. 558.

the hope of establishing communications with a body of the Camisards in arms near Montpellier. They were, however, speedily overpowered by numbers and driven back to their ships. Daun and his army, unable to break through the cordon of Berwick's troops, recrossed the Alps a month later. Meanwhile, after eight months of negotiation, the peace conferences at Gertruydenberg had broken down in June, 1710, over the insoluble question of the evacuation of Spain. Peace was "now farther off than ever".<sup>1</sup>

CHAP.  
VIII.

<sup>1</sup> Rouillé, president of the parliament of Paris, to Petkum, August 11, 1710, *Round MSS.*, p. 351.

## CHAPTER IX.

### THE IMPEACHMENT OF SACHEVERELL.

CHAP. IX. THE ministry now in office presented, it will have been apparent, many contrasts to modern usage. Corporate responsibility, whatever place it may have held in the political ideals of Somers or of Sunderland, was practically unrecognised. The name of prime minister, which expresses this, was not in current use. It may be found occasionally in the writings of Swift, but it bore for long after an unpopular association as a term of French origin and of unconstitutional import. While, in fact, the lord treasurer exercised the functions of the leading member of the cabinet, its members did not conceive themselves bound to the alternative of carrying out his policy or resigning office. The tie between them was the sovereign to whom they were alike the "servants". Between Godolphin and the nominees of the junta co-operation was the outcome of necessity, not of choice. There was a sense among the whigs that the treasurer was ready, for the sake of office, to temporise with principle, and, rather than offend the queen, to allow the intrigues of Harley and Mrs. Masham to prepare their overthrow. There were yet unsatisfied ambitions among the junta. Orford desired office, Halifax had been irritated in 1708 by Marlborough's choice of Townshend as plenipotentiary to the States-general. Somers also, with a reputation for political "virtue," as Macaulay insists, second to none, was dissatisfied and talking of resignation. Though president of the council, he and the other ministers were, they complained, treated as nullities. Nothing but the fear of alarming the allies and the appeasement of Somers by the queen with £1,000 out of the secret service money<sup>1</sup> induced the whigs to

<sup>1</sup> His receipt is signed on April 2, 1709. R.O., MS., Secret Service, 266. It should be observed, however, that the next two receipts, dated October 14,



remain in office. As for Godolphin, sensitive to the friction with the queen on one side and with his whig supporters on the other, he wrote to Marlborough in January, 1709: "The life of a slave in the galleys is paradise in comparison of mine".

CHAP.  
IX.

The services of the Duke of Queensberry in the management of his countrymen were felt by Godolphin to be indispensable. On February 9, 1709, he was appointed a third secretary of state, to take charge of the affairs of Scotland. By this arrangement influential patronage was withdrawn from Sunderland, the most intractable in temper of the junta. Thenceforward undissembled hostility glowered between him and Godolphin. The junta felt that the time had arrived for delivering a counter-attack. Their first attempt to strengthen their position was by recommending Halifax as plenipotentiary to the peace conference in the Netherlands. Against this Marlborough, as before, stood firm, and in such a matter Marlborough's authority was indisputable. Their next effort was to oust Lord Pembroke from the office of lord high admiral. To Orford, the nominee of the junta, both Marlborough and Godolphin were at first opposed. The office was too well paid—Pembroke's salary had been fixed at £7,000 a year<sup>1</sup>—and too influential to be bestowed on a politician beyond their control. Their disapproval was fortified by the resentment of the queen against Orford as an inspirer of the attacks upon her husband's administration of the admiralty. His political and family connexions were, however, too strong to be withstood. When Marlborough and Godolphin withdrew an opposition in which they found no support but that of Boyle, and themselves recommended the appointment, the queen's resistance ceased. At the beginning of November, 1709, Orford was nominated head of the admiralty, but, mindful of the contingencies of party government, he preferred the

1709, and June 24, 1710, respectively, run in the following form:—"£1,000 for an additional allowance of £2,000 which her majesty is pleased to make to my salary as president of her most honourable privy council". These payments, however, throw a disagreeable light upon the halting and equivocal attitude of Somers at the time of Godolphin's dismissal, and account for the distrust felt of him by Godolphin (see Lord Coningsby's "Account" in *Archæol.*, xxxviii., 10-14). Only the Duchess of Marlborough seems to have suspected the truth (*Correspondence*, 1838, ii., 148).

<sup>1</sup> March 30, 1709, 30th Rept. of Deputy-keeper of Public Records, p. 460.

CHAP. office of lord high admiral to be thrown into commission, being  
IX. willing rather to reduce his post to the presidency of a board than to incur undivided responsibility. Sir George Byng and Sir John Leake were associated with him as commissioners. The contest over this appointment, into which the Duchess of Marlborough had thrown herself with her accustomed indiscretion, led to a further exchange of letters between herself and the queen, in which recriminations only served to mark the growing extinction of their friendship. The appearance of *The New Atlantis*, which bespattered the duchess with mud, while it extolled under transparent names the new favourite, Harley, and Peterborough, stirred no displeasure in the queen. No royal congratulations greeted the duchess on the news of Malplaquet. The omission was a symptom that the intriguers had already undermined the influence of the duke himself. The next step of Harley's faction was to prompt the queen to a direct attack upon him.

Marlborough, anticipating a break-up of the ministry and alive to the precarious tenure of his position, judged it opportune to make an attempt to establish himself out of the reach of the vicissitudes of politics. In the autumn of 1709 he sounded the whig leaders as to a proposal for a patent conferring on him the office of captain-general for life. Cowper, whose opinion as chancellor was most important, declared that there was no precedent. Undeterred by this disappointment, the duke made direct application to the queen. Anne's ear had been already filled with suggestions that she was the tool of the ambitions of the Marlboroughs. "She talked," writes Swift, "to a person whom she had taken into confidence as if she apprehended an attempt upon the crown." Her alarm prompted a downright refusal and reconciled her to the duke's threat that he would retire at the end of the war. She followed this up by bestowing the constablership of the Tower, a post in Marlborough's patronage, on Lord Rivers, a friend of Harley's, and in January, 1710, ordered the duke, despite his energetic protest, to give a regiment to Mrs. Masham's brother, Colonel Hill. On this Marlborough appealed to the whigs. He laid before the leaders a letter addressed to the queen in which he detailed his grievances against Mrs. Masham, and added: "I hope your majesty will either dismiss her or myself". Sunderland, as